

EMPLOYING NATURAL DISCOURSE FORMS
IN THE TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE:
ASSESSING A DISCOURSE WORKSHOP

A THESIS-PROJECT
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF
GORDON-CONWELL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

BY
REBECCA S. GROSSMANN

MAY 2019

Copyright ©2019 by Rebecca S. Grossmann. All Rights Reserved.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi
ABSTRACT	xii
Chapter	
1. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING	1
2. THEOLOGICAL REVIEW	8
God Intends to Communicate with Mankind	8
Precedence: Scripture Reveals God's Communicative Nature	9
Old Testament Examples of God Making Himself Known	10
God Uses Various Languages to Make Himself Known	11
God Uses Symbols and Dreams	12
God's Message is Translated	12
All Nations are to Acknowledge God's Message	14
New Testament Examples of God Making Himself Known	15
The New Testament Validates God's Timeless Message	16
Proclamation: Scripture Reveals the Salvation Message	18
The Salvation Message is Presented in Various Forms	20
The New Testament Validates the Original Salvific Message	21
The Salvation Message is Carried Across Cultures	23

Practical Conclusion	24
God's Use of Various Literary Forms as an Example for Today	24
Using the Translation Model of Theology	27
Growing the Church Across Cultures, Contexts, and Genres	29
Natural Forms and Identity	32
3. LITERATURE REVIEW	35
The Nature of Texts and Translation	35
Translator Training and Text Analysis	42
Evaluation of Texts as Evaluation of Training	57
Summary	63
4. PROJECT DESIGN	66
Rationale	66
Overview of the Project	688
Implementation	69
Preparation	69
Classroom Learning	71
Post-workshop Review	766
Evaluation procedure	76
5. OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION	78

Workshop Implementation	78
Preparation	78
Classroom Learning	79
Post-workshop Review	81
Evaluation procedure	82
Materials and Workshop Design	82
Linguistic Analysis and Application	86
Summary of Applied Features to Translated Text	87
Language 1	88
Language 2	92
Evaluation of Course Effectiveness with Recommendations	95
Additional recommendations	96
Appendix	
A. CHARTS OF NATURAL STORIES	100
Language 1	100
The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart A	100
The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart B	105
The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart for Analysis	111
The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart A version 1 by Translator1A	115

The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart A version 2 by Translator1A	118
The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart B by Translator1A	122
The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart A by Translator 1B	125
The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart B by Translator 1B	129
Complaint from the Farm Chart A	132
Complaint from the Farm Chart B	139
Complaint from the Farm Chart for Analysis	148
Complaint from the Farm Chart A by Translator 1C	153
Language 2	158
Zahn Town Chart A	158
Zahn Town Chart B	167
Bush Confusion Chart A	177
Bush Confusion Chart B	185
Bush Confusion Chart for Analysis	192
Bush Confusion Chart A by Translator 2A	197
Bush Confusion Chart B by Translator 2A	202
A Collateral was Converted to Islam Chart for Analysis	207
A Collateral was Converted to Islam Chart B by Translator 2B	212
A Collateral was Converted to Islam Complete Story with Analysis	217

B. MARK TEXT CHARTS	244
Language 1	244
Unanalyzed texts charts	244
Language 2	267
Unanalyzed texts charts	267
C. ASSIGNMENTS – NARRATIVE DISCOURSE WORKSHOP	291
D. ANALYSIS TABLES	304
Translator 1A	304
Table 1: Comparison of Information in Quote Formulas	304
Table 2: Location of Quotations	304
Table 3: Comparison of Peak-marking Features	305
Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers	305
Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within Paragraphs	306
Translator 1B	306
Table 1: Comparison of Information in Quote Formulas	306
Table 2: Location of Quotations	307
Table 3: Comparison of Peak-marking Features	307
Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers	307
Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within Paragraphs	308

Translator 1C	308
Table 1: Comparison of Information in Quote Formulas	308
Table 2: Location of Quotations	309
Table 3: Comparison of Peak-marking Features	309
Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers	309
Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within Paragraphs	310
Translator 2A	310
Table 1: Comparison of Information in Quote Formulas	310
Table 2: Location of Quotations	311
Table 3: Comparison of Peak-marking Features	311
Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers	312
Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within Paragraphs	312
Translator 2B	313
Table 1: Comparison of Information in Quote Formulas	313
Table 2: Location of Quotations	313
E. FINAL ASSIGNMENT	314
F. SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATIONS AND SUMMARY STATEMENTS	316

Week 1 July 2017 Workshop Summary	316
Participant Evaluation – Narrative Discourse Workshop (Liberia)	317
BIBLIOGRAPHY	319
VITA	324

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people contributed to the completion of this project. I am thankful for my colleagues at Lutheran Bible Translators who encouraged me to further my education and who encourage me in the ministry we share together. I am thankful for the many people who partner with me in the work of Bible translation through their generous gifts and prayers.

I would like to thank all those who made the workshop possible particularly Carla Bartsch and her husband Dick who agreed to conduct the workshop, to revise the material to suit the African context, and to allow me to use it here. I want to thank my Liberian colleagues on the translation teams and those working at the Bible Society for their efforts before, during, and after the workshop, and for insights into the workings of their languages.

Thanks is due to my adviser, Dr. Roy Ciampa, who guided the development of the project and patiently advised me throughout the drafting process. Thanks also to mentor Dr. Bryan Harmelink who encourages deeper thought on topics relevant to Bible translation and this project and who also read the document.

I appreciate the inspiration from all those in my cohort. Watching and learning from so many gifted people has been such a blessing and privilege. May you all finish well.

I am equally grateful to my family and friends who have journeyed alongside me and given me the encouragement and time necessary to complete my degree program.

ABBREVIATIONS

ALT Acquired Language Translator

DA discourse analysis

FC formal correspondence

FE functional equivalent

L1 Language one

L2 Language two

MTT Mother-Tongue Translator

NASB New American Standard Bible

NIV New International Version

NLT New Living Translation

NCP Noun class particle

NT New Testament

OT Old Testament

PL popular language

RL receptor language

RT Relevance Theory

SL source language

ST source text

TL target language

ABSTRACT

This project addresses the problem of Bible translations that appear wooden as a result of following a source language text too closely. It examines what effect a discourse training workshop focusing on receptor language structures had on both the personnel and the revisions to selected scripture texts in three translation projects in Liberia, West Africa. The project design is described, and various discourse analysis tools are presented as part of the workshop design. The results of both the workshop process and the outcomes as illustrated in the participant evaluations and their revisions to select texts are summarized. The paper also evaluates and discusses the process, the material, and the outcomes and gives recommendations for improvement and further training.

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

The setting for this thesis-project occurs among three translation projects currently underway in Liberia, West Africa. These are projects which are overseen by the Bible Society in Liberia and for which there is a team of mother-tongue translators for each. Historically, tribal groups along with their distinct languages have been marginalized by the freed slave settlers that founded the political state of Liberia as we know it making English the language of prestige. English is the national language and is used in government, education, and business except in local markets where the local language may well be used along with English. The languages of these tribal groups to this day are often referred to as dialects and are not considered full-fledge languages in the eyes of many. While Bible translation work has gone on in the country well over 100 years, many people use English Bibles. Overall, the literacy rate in any language is very low.

The three translation teams have been previously trained using Barnwell's training manual along with training during regular consultant checking. All have been working on their teams for a minimum of a year, most for several years. They have also been given training in ParaTExt translation software and a brief introduction to the recording software Audacity. Most have had experience prior to their acceptance on the translation teams as oral interpreters, literacy teachers, and/or on previous translation

projects. Their education level ranges from completion of high school to bachelor's degrees. Several are teachers and pastors.

This setting is not the cause of the problem to be addressed in this thesis-project, but it does have implications as we consider peripheral messages related to identity and to the value and acceptability of a translation. English influences on the translation can be strong especially since English versions are the main source texts used in the projects and Christians have much of the English version memorized. The problem this thesis seeks to address is unnaturalness and a tendency to follow the source text structures too closely in translated biblical texts particularly at the discourse level.

This problem stood out to me as I have been checking Bible translations with national teams and could readily recognize which English version source text was used. Following a source text too closely is a common problem in many translation contexts besides Liberia. Cahill and Benn list three causes of this: a natural tendency in the process of translation, respect for the Word, and an unawareness of natural receptor language patterns.¹ In addition to these factors, other factors also contribute to this problem in Liberia. These factors include but are not limited to training, starting from the first verse and proceeding line by line following the source text, the pressure of keeping the translation more similar to a prestige language Biblical version they know, the nature of the Biblical text versing and section heads, the nature of the ParaTExt computer program used in translation, even how they are paid which is by the verse.

Traditional translation training often addresses many of the lower level translation principles and applies a bottom up approach with only small attention to the overall text

¹ Michael Cahill and Keith Benn. "Overliteralness and Mother-Tongue Translators," *Journal of Translation* 7, no.1 (2011): 49.

and its meaning. Topics such as idioms and figures of speech, the meaning of a word, Biblical terms, “of” phrases, order of events, rhetorical questions, active and passive verbs, and other such structures are all important to learn about and usually make for a full introduction to translation principles. Some would say the problem could all be resolved by changing the training and methodology from the beginning using a top-down approach that allows the more intuitive free flow of language.²

I agree a different approach from the beginning should help. But what about the teams who have already started and/or who have already been trained in the former manner? Would such training be sufficient to counteract the natural tendency to follow source structures literally and overcome other factors that lead to more wooden translations were it used from the start? Could a both/and approach capture the best of both intuition and linguistic analysis? I would argue that the other factors already listed leading to literal translations could still influence the discourse structure and methodology of the translators if not given more training. Douglas Robinson suggests that translation happens out of an intuitive process, but he encourages translators to study translation theory, to look at texts from all angles including linguistically. Training will enhance a translator’s abilities. “The difference (between a good translator and a mediocre one) is that the good translator has trained his or her intuitions more thoroughly than the mediocre one, and in relying on those intuitions is actually relying on years of internalized experience and intelligent reflection.”³

Even a top-down approach does not preclude the benefits that could be realized if the translators are trained to recognize and intentionally use natural discourse structures

² See the descriptions of the writings of Culy and Hatim and Mason in Chapter 3.

³ Doug Robinson, *Becoming a Translator* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 221.

in their translations. Many MTTs have never studied the grammar of their own language. Without conscious knowledge, it is difficult for a translator to effectively use natural receptor structures that do not occur in the source text or that differ from the source text structures. This is addressed by several authors discussed in Chapter 3 particularly Halme-Berneking.⁴

Another factor that keeps Bible translators working linearly or verse by verse is the nature of having the Bible set up with chapters and verses. This is reinforced by using the ParaTExt program. Bible book shells are created to make formatting easier and lessen the possibility of leaving a verse out. But it restricts the free flow of thought and writing. Even though we supplied direction to read the whole text, comprehend and then draft the entire story in the case of narrative, possibly even record an oral version first, still the tendency is to go verse by verse partly because it is clumsy to put a whole story into a file where verse markers are already set up. I also see sentences formed based on each verse, a sentence per verse, or an imitation of the English source text sentence breaks.

Even the current payment system encourages a verse by verse method. To make sure that payment is going to productivity, the translators are paid by verse. This was supposed to be only an initial arrangement until a new translator proved his competence and then a salary would be offered. Most of the teams turned down the salary on account that they didn't want to lose their other jobs and so couldn't commit to full-time, or they believed the verse system was more profitable.

⁴ Riikka Halme-Berneking, "Helping Bible Translators Recognize Linguistic Interference between Angolan Bantu Languages and Portuguese," *The Bible Translator* 65, no. 3 (2014): 353-368, accessed June 21, 2017, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2051677014553550>.

Natural sounding text is important because several New Testament translations have sat on the shelf on account of unnatural forms. The translation is hard to read and understand, or possibly is rejected because it sounds foreign. On the other hand, the original New Testament for the Dan language was well used, but people complained saying, “Some of the Dan in there isn’t even Dan.” This time around they have made it clear that they want it to sound like their language.⁵

Many questions arise out of this situation. How can we train translators so that the source language version does not blindly dictate the structures used in the receptor version? In other words, how can we help translators avoid a wooden, literal translation? This involves more than just keeping them from going word for word. Climax, denouement, participant reference and other discourse structures are not the same from language to language. How might identification of discourse markers and features in the receptor language, influence the naturalness and receptivity of a translation? How will translating with these features in focus clarify the message of the biblical text? The two questions that I would like to focus on are: What effect will a discourse workshop have on how teams translate Biblical material? And how will identification of discourse markers and features in the receptor language influence the translation to reflect natural text structures?

The extent of this thesis project will be to evaluate revised translations and translation practice on the part of the teams after conducting a workshop to discover natural discourse forms. Comparative research on acceptability between before and after texts is not in focus in this study as many additional factors influence acceptability and

⁵ Many factors can play into text acceptability such as language prestige, community ownership, local church influence, relationships with the translators, and expectations concerning the style.

such a study is beyond the scope of this project. But it is hoped that a more naturally constructed translation will be more easily understood and accepted.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of a receptor language discourse workshop on translated Biblical material. This thesis project argues that training translators to recognize discourse features in their language will make them better equipped to produce a text that more closely resembles other natural texts in the receptor language. Moreover, they will more readily recognize and use features and structures that they can consciously apply to their translation in places where intuition alone was not sufficient as evidenced in a comparison of before and after workshop texts. Thus, they will produce a more usable and acceptable natural translation which is clearer and possibly more accurate.

Biblical precedence for translation and for using local structures is the focus of Chapter 2. Arguments presented illuminate situations where God utilized local forms of communication in both language and other means to relay his message to people. These illustrations show how God intended to get his message of salvation to all people and what implications this has on Bible translation.

In Chapter 3, I review literature relevant to the concepts of texts and translation, translator training, and evaluation of translation. How to approach training coincides with the translation methodology various authors present whether translation starts from the bottom or the top, whether one starts from the lower forms to the discourse or vice versa. Very little has been written to quantify translators' usage of local level discourse forms after training, but a few pieces do speak to the subject and give some tools for evaluation.

Chapter 4 contains a description of the workshop and the tools used for analysis of the natural and biblical texts as well as for comparison of translated Biblical texts. It describes how the workshop was carried out.

Chapter 5 discusses the outcomes of the workshop and evaluates the workshop tools, implementation and overall effect on the translated texts and the translation teams. Effort is made to show some of the specific effects and changes to the text as well as to discuss what did not happen. Recommendations are given for future training and the importance of continued training in the RL structures.

Hopefully, the assessment of this workshop aimed at developing the capacity of MTTs to recognize and use the natural discourse forms of their language in their Bible translation projects will encourage translation teams to explore their own discourse features. Whether they are a new team or a seasoned team, exposure to such discoveries will aid in diminishing the source language interferences that are common in translation. This document opens only a small window on the subject, but perhaps will spur others to explore further and develop not only methodology but greater capacity all around for the use of forms that will most clearly relay the Gospel message.

CHAPTER 2

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

God Intends to Communicate with Mankind

In the past God spoke to our forefathers through the prophets at many times and in various ways, but in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, and through whom he made the universe. The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word (Heb 1:1-3).¹

The God of the Bible displays his desire to communicate with creation from the very first events of time as we know it up until the present day. As one reads through the various books of the Bible, God can be seen communicating in a variety of situations, to a variety of people, through a variety of means. He "evidently intended for his revelatory words and deeds to be mediated by the people formed by his covenantal love."² This chapter will illuminate how God contextualized his message throughout Scripture as he participates in the lives of his people. It will examine how the nature of his communication and the means of revelation serve as a foundation and precedence for the translation of the Bible in the natural forms of the target audience with a focus not only concerning lexical meaning but also concerning forms, devices, and structures contextualized for the receptor language group. It will also examine God's example of his proclamation of salvation through his pursuit of mankind and ultimately the incarnation and his mandate to likewise proclaim the salvation message. Finally, this chapter will

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture citations in this paper are taken from the New International Version (New York: International Bible Society, 1984).

² Matthew Levering, *Engaging the Doctrine of Revelation: The Mediation of the Gospel through Church and Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014), 1.

connect this evidence with the necessity of using local discourse forms to most clearly communicate God's salvation and thus confirm one's identity in Christ.

Precedence: Scripture Reveals God's Communicative Nature

Both testaments give witness of God's communicative nature. The New Testament as seen in the Hebrews verses above as well as 2 Pet 1:21 and Acts 1:16 claims that God communicated himself successfully to humanity through oral proclamation as well as the written word. God did this in an incarnational way meaning that in addition to the obvious incarnation of Christ, God used created means to proclaim the message. "Why should we not gladly accept the humanity of scripture as the vehicle of revelation? And why should not the created order and linguistic forms in general serve as media of revelation?"³ God is also consistently portrayed as wanting to communicate with humanity and "that this communication was successful is obvious in the rehearsal of these words within the biblical text itself...The Scriptures represent God's successful communication of his character and ways."⁴

While the following examples will by no means be exhaustive, they should be sufficient to illustrate God's communicative nature and that he chooses to use the language in respect to both lexical and discourse features of the language of the people he is reaching thus giving us an example to follow. The nature of God's revelation is such that it adapts to the situation as seen previously in the Hebrews passage above; God is willing and has demonstrated that he will use not only oral and written means in various

³ Colin E. Gunton, *A Brief Theology of Revelation: The 1993 Warfield Lectures* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995), 124.

⁴ Mark J. Boda, "Biblical Theology and Old Testament Interpretation," in *Hearing the Old Testament: Listening for God's Address*, eds. Craig G. Bartholomew and David J. H. Beldman (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2012), 128, 129.

languages, but even go as far as transforming himself for a particular situation in order to communicate with people.

Old Testament Examples of God Making Himself Known

Bird points out that God is unknowable on many levels until he reveals himself to people and that sometimes this is not to people who were necessarily looking for him. God spoke to Abraham (Gen 12:1-10), to Jacob (Gen 32:24-32), and to Moses (Exod 3:15; 6:3) revealing to him a name which up to that point had been unknown. Simeon was told he would not die until he saw the Messiah (Luke 2:26) and Saul was confronted with the risen Christ (Acts 9:1-22). Isaiah writes, “I revealed myself to those who did not ask for me; I was found by those who did not seek me. To a nation that did not call on my name, I said, ‘Here am I, here am I’” (Isa 65:1).⁵ This latter example gives a precedent to take God’s message to everyone even to those who are not necessarily looking for it. All these examples, of course, are recorded in the Scriptures using language forms meant to be clear and reveal God’s intention to make himself known.

Chapter one of Genesis begins with the account of creation. God speaks and the elements he creates “listen” and become that which he desires. God is a god of speech, of words, of text. John 1:1 takes off from this theme – “In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God.” God’s very nature is equated with communication, with words, with existence and identity. Gen 2:19 shows us that God gave people the ability of speech and even commanded that the man he created be the one to name the animals. Whatever language God was using with people at that time, he gave

⁵ Michael F. Bird, *Evangelical Theology: A Biblical and Systematic Introduction* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2013), 168.

place for it to be developed by man himself. God and man were communicating together and cooperatively.

During the first events of the newly created world, God gave the man and woman a command that he expected them to obey. Thus, when they did not obey as recorded in Genesis 3, they had to face consequences brought about by their disobedience. The expectation was that they understood the message. When God came to find them, a very intimate conversation in God's presence took place. We see a God who pursues his creation, desires communication with them, and desires to make himself known to them. Many other examples throughout Scripture indicate that when God communicated a command, obedience was expected. Take Noah, Moses, the people of Israel, various prophets, and Jesus' simple command, "Follow me." Ps 9:17 reads, "The wicked return to the grave, all the nations that forget God." God's expectation was that he was communicating in a way to be understood and thus to be obeyed not just by the chosen but by all peoples. This is only possible if the communication is taking place in a language the receiver understands.

God Uses Various Languages to Make Himself Known

More events from Genesis indicate that God's communications were probably in more than one language at various times. God meant to be heard by all people. Genesis 9 records a covenant that was for Noah and all people after him. Gen 10:5 already indicates that these descendants of Noah would have their own languages: "From these the maritime peoples spread out into their territories by their clans within their nations, *each with its own language.*" God's covenant promise would have to be translated to be kept by future generations. The next chapter reveals that God himself confused the language

with one result being that people would obey the command to fill the earth. If God was going to continue to be a communicating God, he would have to do it in the various languages he now created.

God Uses Symbols and Dreams

Genesis 9 and the symbol of the rainbow indicate that God did not just use words to send a message, but other signs that could be understood by people of any language or ethnicity. When God wanted to communicate with Pharaoh, he used dreams as recorded in Genesis 41. He wanted Pharaoh to understand and so used Joseph to interpret. Dan 2 reports a somewhat similar event. Both the king's advisors and Daniel gave credit to deity for such interpretation. The dreams were a form that sent the message that this is probably something divine. Then God used words in the language of the king to clarify his message. The dream indicates God acting through the granting of the dream and then also in his words in the dream. Dreams are also recorded in the NT guiding Joseph and Mary (Matt 1:20; 2:12-13, 9, 22) and Pilate's wife (Matt 27:19).⁶

God's Message is Translated

More indications of God translating his message to the people show up in other stories throughout the Old and New Testaments. Take Moses and Joseph as well as any other Bible characters who spent time in Egypt. While some of their conversations must have taken place in a language other than Hebrew, the events are still recorded for the Hebrew people in Hebrew. Joseph used an interpreter to keep his identity hidden until the proper time to reveal himself to his brothers. Abraham moved from Haran to Canaan, probably requiring some language acquisition. Moses grew up in Pharaoh's court. He

⁶ T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner, *New Dictionary of the Bible Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 733.

visited his fellow Hebrews. He fled to Midian. He would have been multilingual. The events for him would have occurred in several languages and yet he translated and wrote them down in only one.

The events from Genesis being attributed to the authorship of Moses were not recorded in written form until much later. Whether or not the language God spoke was Hebrew, the events as we know them and as they came to us, are in the Hebrew language. Many of the forms and practices are also similar to the ancient near eastern cultures around them showing how God adapted and contextualized his message to the audience.⁷ We do know that manuscripts were updated through the centuries just by the example of the Masoretic text and the vowel pointing being added later. “From data within the Bible and from knowledge of ancient Near Eastern scribal practices we can infer that during the formation of the OT books, there was a tendency both to preserve and to revise earlier texts.”⁸ Some sort of translation and/or revision occurred along the way so that God’s message could continue to be communicated throughout the generations.

When the people of Israel were exiled, other languages would have been the medium of communication. The book of Daniel has portions in Aramaic. Thus, written examples exist that God’s people were adaptive to the local dialects. The astronomers from the East that came after Jesus’ birth may have learned of the prophecies through some of those in exile. While the Israelites lived in Babylon, and as we can see through

⁷ John H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006), 24.

⁸ Bruce K. Waltke, "Textual Criticism of the Old Testament and Its Relation to Exegesis and Theology," in *A Guide to Old Testament Theology and Exegesis: The Introductory Articles from the New International Dictionary of the Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, by ed. Willem A. VanGemerenf (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999), 51.

the interactions of Daniel and friends with Nebuchadnezzar, they bore witness to God's law as they lived in exile thus translating God's message for their captors.

All Nations are to Acknowledge God's Message

The book of Psalms is full of admonitions for all nations to praise God. See for example Ps 22:27. "All the ends of the earth will remember and turn to the Lord, and all the families of the nations will bow down before him." Ps 45:17 reads "I will perpetuate your memory through all generations; therefore, the nations will praise you for ever and ever." Jesus used the beginning words of Ps 22 when he was on the cross. Jesus was connecting himself with a messianic psalm, translating himself if you will, into this verse and pointing to the reality that God's message and his salvation are for all people giving us precedence to make this message known in the languages of today.

This expectation of the praise of God by all nations is reiterated in Rev 7:9 where a crowd from every nation, tribe, people, and language is standing around the throne praising God. Obviously, God is a god who embraces the languages of the world and expects to be communicated and understood by peoples of all languages. Translation and contextualization of his message is a built-in assumption throughout all of scripture. As John Walton indicates, God would have to accommodate the local languages in order to effectively communicate.

Effective communication requires a body of agreed upon words, terms, and ideas. Since communication requires a common ground of understanding, both speaker and audience must do what they can to enter that common ground. For the speaker this often requires accommodation to the audience. One uses words (representing ideas) that the audience will understand, thus, by definition, accommodating to the target audience.⁹

⁹ Walton, Ancient Near Eastern Thought, 19-20.

New Testament Examples of God Making Himself Known

As we move into the New Testament writings, we see examples of quotations that are translated back into the Greek of the text. Quotations such as when Jesus healed Jairus' daughter. "He took her by the hand and said to her, 'Talitha koum!' (which means, 'Little girl, I say to you, get up!')" (Mark 5:41). From the cross he said, "'Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?' – which means, 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?'" (Matt 27:46). The need to translate was obvious as some of those present thought he was calling Elijah. These translations indicate that the events took place in a different language than that which was chosen to communicate the message broadly. In Acts 26:14 where Paul is describing his conversion, he specifically states that the voice spoke in Aramaic and yet he must be speaking in Greek as he relayed the story, and the author of Acts used Greek as well. There are other instances where Paul uses Aramaic to speak to the people such as in Acts 9:36, 21:40, 22:2. In fact, Jesus probably was most often speaking Aramaic to his disciples while teaching them and yet when they distributed this teaching to others, they chose to use the language of wider communication which was Greek.

Another characteristic of Scripture that Boda points out is that the Scriptures are written and viewed as authoritative as noted in such verses as 2 Tim 3:15-16 discussed below. Elsewhere the familiar "it is written" points to the value the New Testament writers gave to the Old Testament writings.¹⁰ Bird concurs with this point as well. The Scriptures are not just words people have written to tell about God, but they are the story of God giving words to people. Jesus himself regarded the Scriptures as such. See

¹⁰ Boda, "Biblical Theology," 131.

Matt. 4:4 or John 10:35. Jesus' own words as well are regarded as the word of God as seen in such passages as Luke 5:1 or 8:11.¹¹ Because these are the words of God, the revelation given in them carries authority and is truthful. “It’s writers and chief figures repeatedly assert that their enscripturated claims are true and can be tested.”¹² God cannot lie (Heb 6:18). See such verses as Deut 13:1-3; 18:20-22; Jer 28:9; Rom 9:1; Gal 1:20.

The New Testament Validates God’s Timeless Message

In addition, the NT writers made many connections between OT revelation and its fulfillment. See such passages as Matt 1:23; 3:3 and Rom 1:2 for a few examples.¹³ The fact that most of these Old Testament quotations found in the New used the translated text of the Septuagint¹⁴ further exemplifies a precedent to use that which will best communicate to the audience. God’s word is not limited to a single language.

The apostle Paul writes in 2 Tim 3:16 that all of Scripture was God-breathed – “what humans have said through the Spirit and what God has said through humans.”¹⁵ God chose to inspire the writers to write in a language of greater distribution so that more people would access the message. At the same time, this passage says, “All scripture is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training...” God’s spirit interacts with both the authors of scripture and the readers. Because of this, translation is possible as the text is transmitted to a new audience, God’s spirit will continue to interact with the readers of that text.¹⁶ “All Scripture” at that time was written in both Hebrew and Greek having

¹¹ Bird, *Evangelical Theology*, 197.

¹² Alexander and Rosner, *New Dictionary*, 736.

¹³ Alexander and Rosner, *New Dictionary*, 736.

¹⁴ Richard B. Hays, *Reading Backwards* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014), xiv.

¹⁵ Kevin Vanhoozer, “Imprisoned or Free?: Text, Status, and Theological Interpretation in the Master/Slave Discourse of Philemon,” in *Reading Scripture with the Church: Toward a Hermeneutic for Theological Interpretation*, eds. A. K. M. Adam, Stephen E. Fowl, Kevin J. Vanhoozer, and Francis Watson (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006), 63.

¹⁶ Vanhoozer, “Imprisoned or Free?,” 76.

been translated from the Hebrew into the Greek Septuagint. This version is what is usually quoted by the New Testament authors. They had no problem using a translation of the Scripture to communicate God's message to their current audiences. The whole of the New Testament is really a translation of the Old in that God's message of salvation is not only being written and clarified to new audiences but is being fulfilled and lived out in the lives of Jesus and his followers.

The beginnings of the new Christian church were a result of a mass translation. Here the events at Babel come full circle as God gathers the nations back together and reveals himself to them. The events at Pentecost indicate once again God's heart for all nations. Spontaneously and with the Spirit's help, the various peoples present in Jerusalem heard the words of the disciples being proclaimed in their own languages. The story does not indicate a chain event like in interpretive situations today where one language is translated on the spot following an utterance in a second language. The story from Acts 2 indicates that there were people from every nation on earth and that they all heard at once the same message but each in his/her own language. God was making himself known and communicating successfully as indicated by the people's response. All of them were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues as the Spirit enabled them as recorded in Acts 2:5-11, 41.

Now there were staying in Jerusalem God-fearing Jews from every nation under heaven. When they heard this sound, a crowd came together in bewilderment, because each one heard them speaking in his own language. Utterly amazed, they asked: "Are not all these men who are speaking Galileans? Then how is it that each of us hears them in his own native language? Parthians, Medes and Elamites; residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya near Cyrene; visitors from Rome (both Jews and converts to Judaism); Cretans and Arabs—we hear them declaring the wonders of God in our own tongues!... Those who accepted his message were baptized, and about three thousand were added to their number that day.

Conclusively, we see a history of God translating his message at various times and places throughout history as recorded in the Scriptures. The Scriptures themselves often being that translated message. God even chose to send Jesus at a time and place where in order to reach the masses, translation was expected and necessary to make his salvation known. God demonstrates by his own actions that he will use whatever means necessary to communicate with us his creation. He is not limited by form, time, culture, or context. In general revelation he uses the witness of creation—“the heavens declare the glory of God” (Ps 19:1.). Specifically, he has revealed himself through such means as the pillar of cloud and fire in the desert (Exod 13:22), the manna (Exod 16:31), a wet fleece (Judg 6:37), a hand writing on a wall (Dan 5:5, 24), a donkey (Num 22:28), through the stars and in dreams (Matt 2:2, 12), the written word, and eventually in the form of Jesus Christ. He has set a precedent for communicating with people and doing so in whatever means will be the clearest.

Proclamation: Scripture Reveals the Salvation Message

“All four canonical Gospels declare that the Torah and the Prophets and the Psalms mysteriously prefigure Jesus.”¹⁷ This brings us to the next part of this review, namely the proclamation of salvation by God throughout history and as commanded by him to proclaim to all people. A key passage is recorded in Gen 12:2-3 which reads:

I will make you into a great nation and I will bless you; I will make your name great, and you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and whoever curses you I will curse; and all peoples on earth will be blessed through you.

¹⁷ Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 3.

This passage sums up the very basis for all of Scripture: to point us to God's intentions to bless all nations. This would mean all those speaking any variety of languages. We can connect this with Jesus' command in Matt 28:19-20 where he also sends his followers out to all nations to baptize and teach. "Teaching" would indicate that translation will be necessary in order to pass on the instructions of Jesus. So, God tells us to translate as he says, "make known among the nations what he has done" (1 Chron 16:8b). While the commonality of this theme could place it under the previous section as precedent, the fact that translation occurred not only out of necessity but also by the express command of God, it will be given special consideration.

Again, the Psalms assert God's desire for all nations to know him. Ps 9:11 reads "proclaim among the nations what he has done," echoing the passage in 1 Chronicles above. Jer 31:34, which is repeated in Heb 8:11, says, "'No longer will a man teach his neighbor, or a man his brother, saying, "Know the Lord," because they will all know me, from the least of them to the greatest,' declares the Lord." In order to do that, the message must be translated. Acts 1:8 again reiterates the need for translation as the disciples cover the entire earth. "But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes on you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth." Jesus was not telling his disciples anything new. He simply made it very clear. Such translation had the blessing of the power of the Holy Spirit behind it as we saw in the Pentecost account.

Throughout the Scriptures we see God's intention to proclaim the salvation he would send: Gen 3:15; Gen 12 as quoted above; the example he gave through his interactions with the children of Israel; and the continued line of prophets to remind the

people of the coming savior. “The distinct mark of the revelatory character of the Bible is its relation to salvation in Christ the mediator of salvation.”¹⁸ In the Old Testament book of Jonah, we have an account of God sending someone intentionally to a foreign nation to proclaim that message. While nothing is mentioned in the book itself concerning the languages used, very likely Jonah had to make some adjustment for a city that was part of the Assyrian empire.

The Salvation Message is Presented in Various Forms

We’ve already established that God used forms that he expected people to understand, forms like those used by the peoples around them. We find that God did this not only through common words, languages and practices, but through the very incarnation of Jesus through which he affirms his creation and the cultures tied to it. God accommodated human beings by becoming human, one of the greatest translation and proclamation feats of all. Not only did Jesus come as a tangible human, but he came at a time when God’s message of salvation could go out most effectively in all of history up until that time. He chose a time regardless of the fact that the language of greater communication now differed from when he originally promised to save the world. “The incarnation reveals the compatibility between divine and human spheres of existence.”¹⁹

We see in Jesus a transformation of God’s message as he refreshed forms and practices and deepened their meanings through his birth, life, teachings, death and resurrection. “You have heard it said...but I tell you...” is a common refrain in Matthew 5. He was translating God’s intentions in a much fuller and real way. The book of Mark and the other Gospel accounts record the many ways Jesus took the Old

¹⁸ Gunton, *A Brief Theology*, 73.

¹⁹ Bird, *Evangelical Theology*, 208.

Testament Scriptures and incorporated them in his message to the people. There are approximately 330 allusions to the Old Testament in the Gospels.²⁰ However, one who is not familiar with the Old Testament images will have a harder time understanding the message written by those such as Mark as he weaves throughout his witness many allusions to then familiar images.²¹

The New Testament Validates the Original Salvific Message

Matthew chose to be a bit more overt as he sets out to show how Jesus fulfills prophecy. Matthew “conditions readers to expect that nearly everything in the story of Jesus will turn out to be the fulfillment of something pre-scripted by God.”²² Jesus speaks of a kingdom, of the Sabbath, of forgiveness, and the bridegroom; and he healed, loosing the chains of both physical and spiritual bondage. All these teachings and actions had direct ties to Scripture passages the people were very familiar with as they looked for the Davidic heir, the promised rest, and the savior who would free the captives. See such passages as Ps 103:3, Isa 9:7, 42:7, 62:5; Hosea 2:19, and Mic 7:18. The Major Prophets are especially alluded to when considering Christ. They, out of all the Old Testament books, were constantly looking for the Davidic heir, the just ruler that was to come. The New Testament Scriptures frequently cite these messianic texts “to explain Jesus’ mission and, surprisingly, also attribute to him various activities associated with God himself.... (compare Ezek 34:11 with Luke 15:1-7; 19:10; Isa 35:4-6 with Matt 11:5; and Isa 52:10 with Luke 2:30-31.)”²³

²⁰ Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 78.

²¹ Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 17.

²² Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 36, 37.

²³ Richard Schultz, “Hearing the Major Prophets” in *Hearing the Old Testament: Listening for God’s Address*, eds. Craig G. Bartholomew and David J. H. Beldman (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2012), 335.

While this intertextuality keeps readers today on our toes, the people of that time would have been more familiar with the passages and themes Jesus used. Some recognized who Jesus was even if they didn't fully understand what being the Messiah meant and others at least recognized who he was claiming to be. Jesus took the scriptures and translated them into the reality of himself. This intertextuality attests to God's approval of translation and contextualization as each event and allusion transforms the already familiar text.

The New Testament writers chose their words carefully as they proclaimed the Gospel message through and about this Jesus who became the incarnate version of the Old Testament ideas.

The pervasive, complex, and multivalent uses of Scripture that we find in the Gospels could arise only in and for a community immersed in scriptural language and imagery... Their way of pursuing what we call 'doing theology' was to produce richly intertextual narrative accounts of the significance of Jesus.²⁴

Luther, as quoted in Hays, had an interesting image when describing this practice. "But Christ says in John 5, 'Search the Scriptures, for it is they that bear witness to me.' ... Simple and lowly are these swaddling cloths, but dear is the treasure, Christ, who lies in them."²⁵ Jesus, Paul, Philip, and other apostles are recorded explaining how the Old Testament Scriptures talk about Jesus. Jesus promised that those who would pay attention to these familiar passages and the themes and lessons he taught would in fact grasp the message. "'Consider carefully what you hear,' he continued. 'With the measure you use, it will be measured to you—and even more. Whoever has will be given more; whoever does not have, even what he has will be taken from him'" (Mark 4:24-25).

²⁴ Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 103.

²⁵ Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 1.

The gospel message is both a new and old message as we see it fulfilled in Jesus.

The gospel gains its currency from the fact that it stands in continuity with God's prior revelation of himself to Israel as laid out in Israel's Scriptures...Jesus refers to the necessity and predictability of his death and resurrection...'beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he explained to them what was said in all the Scriptures concerning himself' (Luke 24:27).²⁶

We see Jesus explain, proclaim, and translate afresh what the Old Testament writings were saying about God's message and acts of salvation.

The Salvation Message is Carried Across Cultures

The Gospels recount several stories where Jesus crossed cultures, such as his encounters with the Samaritan and Syrophoenician women. The Apostles followed suit where Paul and then Peter acknowledge that the message of salvation was also for the Gentiles. One striking passage that indicates the progressive ongoing nature of the gospel message comes from Jesus when he declared that the act of devotion by the woman in Mark 14:1-9 would be told in her remembrance wherever the gospel was preached. Jesus expected that this gospel message was for all people and would reach their ears in a way they would know about this woman as they would come to know also the good news of salvation. God desires for all to know him and the Scriptures record his command to proclaim his salvation as well as record events demonstrating that proclamation and its distribution in a variety of contexts and languages. "The gospel becomes a speech-act whereby God acts in and through the words of proclamation about his Son to bring us to faith."²⁷

As God interacted through different authors, he translated his message to us through the hand of various human authors, speaking different languages. The

²⁶ Bird, *Evangelical Theology*, 164.

²⁷ Bird, *Evangelical Theology*, 165.

intertextuality of much of the New Testament writings where Old Testament quotations are brought in and allusions made to many Old Testament events is a kind of translation. The entire New Testament is an intertextual text that translates God's message of salvation to audiences both new and old as it refers to the many themes and promises of God and how they were now happening. The divine author of all scripture has remained the same and his promised plan has been the same throughout, even as it has been delivered in a variety of ways and through a variety of languages. So, as the Holy Spirit "calls, gathers, and enlightens"²⁸ the Christian church on earth, we can be assured that translation will be and should be a natural part of the continued proclamation of God's message to the church and to the nations.

Practical Conclusion

God's Use of Various Literary Forms as an Example for Today

The discussion of God's communicative nature that is forever recorded in the Scriptures shows us that God has not only made himself known in a variety of ways, times, and circumstances, but this communication comes in a variety of genres both written and oral. "One of the marvels of our God is that we hear his voice as it is mediated through human writers, using the conventions of literary composition at their disposal."²⁹ Narrative, narrative examples of oral text, poems, songs, proverbs, hortatory, and apocalyptic texts are but a few of the genres by which God gives us his message. The prophets and Jesus used a variety of genres and literary devices as Ernst Wendland says,

²⁸ *Luther's Small Catechism with Explanation* (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1986), 17.

²⁹ David J. H. Beldman, "Literary Approaches and Old Testament Interpretation," In *Hearing the Old Testament: Listening for God's Address*, eds. Craig G. Bartholomew and David J. H. Beldman (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2012), 71.

“In the Scriptures we find many different texts that manifest both beauty and power in the presentation of their intended message.”³⁰

The Scriptures use literature in a variety of ways to express God’s address and this, of course, includes various discourse types.

...the Old Testament affirms that the Creator of the cosmos and Redeemer of Israel came to us in human form and dwelt among us. This God communicated to his people via the many forms of ancient Hebrew literature we find in the Old Testament. By giving attention to the literary dimension of the Old Testament we affirm that *our* Creator and *our* Redeemer speaks *to us* through these literary forms.³¹

Beldman cautions that we should not reduce the Bible to mere literature, but we should not ignore the literary aspects and what they mean. Iain Provan reiterates this view when he says, “...translators as much as interpreters really must take seriously the art of the biblical story as well as its facts, and try to communicate both to others.”³² While his point is to pay attention to the meanings of the forms and structures in the source language, one would have to pay close attention to such features in the receptor language as well if one wants to make a translation that is as clever, clear, and artful as the original.

Students of discourse features in literature know that the form contains meaning. The form will direct the interpretation. For example, the apocalyptic passages leave us pondering over the meaning as this form does not intend to be literal. A literal interpretation leads people astray. One must know that the nature of the text is not meant to be literal. Much has been written about the genres of the Hebrew and Greek texts

³⁰ Ernst Wendland, *Translating the Literature of Scripture: A Literary -Rhetorical Approach to Bible Translation*, (Dallas: SIL International, 2004), 33, quoted in Philip A. Noss, ed. *A History of Bible Translation* (Rome, Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 2007), 15.

³¹ Beldman, “Literary Approaches,” 95.

³² Iain Provan, “Hearing the Historical Books” in *Hearing the Old Testament: Listening for God’s Address*, eds. Craig G. Bartholomew and David J. H. Beldman (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2012), 268.

which is not the focus here. However, in as much as the genres and discourse markers bear meaning in the originals, so too they will bear meaning in the receptor texts and must be taken most seriously at the translation desk.

What might a genre communicate about God? Or, what might the choice to use a certain genre for a particular text in the receptor language communicate? It may or may not be similar to the source language. Just as there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the morphemes of two languages, we can predict the same will hold true of discourse markers and genres and their various structures between languages. “When we study an ancient text, we cannot make words mean whatever we want them to or assume that they meant the same to the ancient audience that they do to a modern audience.”³³ Language is bound to a culture. Similarly, as words have meaning in their context, in their culture, so that we can’t assume one word means the same to us as it did a hundred years ago, literary genres follow suit. “Some genres would have operated differently in the ancient world than they do in our own culture.”³⁴

Translation is a necessary component to God’s communication with us. This involves not just words, but words properly used in context which would include the proper setting in the genre. Walton gives the example of the building of the tower of Babel. Misunderstanding of what words meant led some theologians to say the people were building in order to make an attack on heaven when in the context of the ancient near east the idea was that the tower would allow for a bridge between heavenly beings and earth.³⁵ The role of the interpreter and translator is to fill in the missing gaps.

³³ Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought*, 20.

³⁴ Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought*, 22.

³⁵ Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought*, 25.

Otherwise, has the message been communicated? And if not translated appropriately into the receptor language's use of words and groups of words, is it a translation at all? "A text can be thought of as a web of ideas linked by threads of writing."³⁶ Again, the threads must be the ones that are contextually and culturally attuned to the audience.

Using the Translation Model of Theology

Stephen Bevins describes several models of theology formation in his book "Models of Contextual Theology" based on the starting perspective of the theologian. The translation model of theology has something to offer the translator of the Scripture text. One of its presuppositions is that there is a supracultural and supracontextual message or the "gospel core." The language used to communicate is simply a husk or vehicle.³⁷ David Hesselgrave, while discussing theology, says that the message must first be decontextualized by understanding the original message thoroughly. Then the respondent culture must be studied thoroughly to contextualize the message to it.³⁸ The same holds true of the text itself. Each language has its morphology and discourse forms and features that bear denotative and connotative meanings. The message of the text or "gospel core" must be taken from the original text and contextualized as much in every way to the receptor language so that the recipients can understand and thus the making of disciples becomes reality.

Peter Jensen also addresses the message of the text and that we are to be stewards of that message which is the role of textual critics. But his next two points address the presentation of the message. "We are seeking a fruitful mode of reading, and the process

³⁶ Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought*, 25.

³⁷ Stephen B. Bevans, *Models of Contextual Theology* (Maryknoll, NY, Orbis, 2008), 40.

³⁸ Bevans, *Models*, 46.

of reading is affected by the manner in which a text is prepared. There are aesthetic considerations here, as well as the obvious point of accessibility.”³⁹ He applauds those versions that in their presentation “do justice to the nature of the Bible and effectively promote the business of reading it...The language of a text must engage attention.”⁴⁰ The language carries the text, and he discusses the importance of various features such as metaphor, irony, plot, structure, patterns, rhythm and other rhetorical devices. He asks us to consider these all along with genre and the functions performed by words and sentences. God’s word or text is contained in the language on the page and therefore the forms are an important way of conveying the message and must be considered within the context of that particular language’s usage.

A. K. M. Adam talks about translation as people interacting and living out the scriptures. This “signifying practice” includes textual interpretation which is going to happen no matter what language the text is in.⁴¹ However, it seems logical that a person is going to more clearly put the text into practice if the text has been put into the language (words and forms) that makes the most sense to the reader. In fact, there would be a greater opportunity for misinterpretation (think mis-translation) in the mind of the reader if the text was in language forms difficult for the reader to understand. Jesus doesn’t define a bunch of specifics for the command to love your neighbor, but we recognize it when we see it by the story of the good Samaritan. Jesus took a concept and translated it

³⁹ Peter Jensen, *The Revelation of God: Contours of Christian Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 210.

⁴⁰ Jensen, *The Revelation of God*, 211.

⁴¹ A. K. M. Adam, “Poaching on Zion: Biblical Theology as Signifying Practice,” in *Reading Scripture with the Church: Toward a Hermeneutic for Theological Interpretation*, eds. A. K. M. Adam, Stephen E. Fowl, Kevin J. Vanhoozer, and Francis Watson (Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic, 2006), 28.

into a story, so people would understand. God expects us to translate his message into our everyday contexts which would include the local language with all its natural structures.

Growing the Church Across Cultures, Contexts, and Genres

We also must consider that as we are making disciples, that means disciples of the word. It is not realistic to think that the only interpreters of Scripture are going to be educated exegetes. The new recipients are going to study the scripture texts in the contexts of their homes and churches much like we do, and that is going to mean studying the genre. If the genre of the receptor language is not appropriate or well-formed for the text, then we confound this new theologian. Both Adam and Fowl express the desire to allow for abundance or a multi-faceted approach. If we are to benefit from the variety of contextual facets found in a given translation situation, it seems that translation done using the variety of devices and particularities of the receptor language will be a necessary component.

Getting back to Adam and his signifying practice, the use of a genre for a certain message would in itself convey some sort of meaning. Adam gives an example of how groups of people might communicate something through their dress, music, or speech.⁴² This can be further applied to the task of translation. If someone having heard popular stories in our culture beginning with “once upon a time” wanted to relate a true story to us using that opening line, he would have a hard time getting people to believe his message and now has actually given us wrong meaning. A certain discourse form gives the hearer a message. It could be a meta-message such as “this person either doesn’t care enough or is too stupid to tell a story right” and thus the message is ignored. Or, the

⁴² Adam, “Poaching on Zion,” 29.

message is misunderstood or ignored, perhaps because a wrong discourse marker was used or because what one needed to indicate the truth of what was being said is absent. Taking a cue from the writer of the Gospel of Luke, writing an orderly account (think natural forms) would help people know the certainty of that which is being taught.

Walton gives ten principles of comparative study where he makes a point to say that different genres can mean different things and that similar functions might be communicated by different genres in different cultures. Walton strongly suggests the need for comparative studies so that the cognitive environment of the Bible can be understood since the modern-day reader needs to know the frames of reference to understand the text. Without translation of both the proper words and the forms, the text will not be understood. Walton gives an example from the account of Hezekiah where some terms were translated in earlier English translations as names instead of titles.⁴³ The clarity of the passage is compromised where only the words were considered; a proper understanding of the context and the use of the words at the time produced a clearer result.

My argument here is that the nature and style of some translations tends to preserve the foreign form of the source text thinking that merely the words are enough or that they can make up for the foreign format of the translation if they just have the right words because perhaps for the most part it will be understood. But is a psalm set up in Hebrew poetry structure able to grab the heart of a modern-day Christian the way the Hebrew poetry communicated to its original audience? Isn't that part of the message? Or how about Jesus' parables with their subtle lessons woven in? Many cultures have similar

⁴³ Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern*, 27.

(but different) structures for teaching. Things “lost in translation” can’t always be helped, but perhaps there are other means the receptor language uses to communicate the same meaning, devices that are para-lexical such as genre, order of events, repetition, or quotation forms. When seeing the repetition in Hebrew poetry or a play on words, a savvy translator knowing well the local language tools may very well be able to convey the emphasis or evoke the response that comes not from words but from the form. It behooves the translators to use the structures that communicate similarly. “If as believing readers we are convinced that ‘God imparts himself to [us,] his image bearers’ in the Old and New Testament, then attention to *how* he communicates to us (i.e., through historical narrative, poetry, wisdom sayings, etc.) is nonnegotiable.”⁴⁴ If the “how” is important, these structures must be examined and understood in order to make effective use of appropriate receptor language structures.

Beldman quotes Patrick Miller who asks questions like “What does poetry mean theologically or what does it mean theologically that we have poetry in the Bible?”⁴⁵ The answer to these questions reveals a God who seeks to get our attention, who will use all available means to do so. Poetry communicates to our senses in a way that prose cannot. It evokes different responses, a sense of awe, worship, lament. God embraces all of humanity and our condition. He embraces our intellect and our emotion. It is fitting that his communication with us reflects that characteristic. As a God who has demonstrated the desire to be known, and as a God who has demonstrated a capacity for entering into the world intimately in different contexts and in a variety of ways, it only follows that in each culture, with each person, he has that same desire. Our translations will do a better

⁴⁴ Beldman, “Literary Approaches,” 68.

⁴⁵ Beldman, “Literary Approaches,” 86.

job of communicating the nature of God when they use the receptor language features that speak naturally and intimately with the hearers.

Natural Forms and Identity

Since God's identity and making himself known is the preeminent message of scripture, being his image bearers means that our identity is closely tied to God's overall address for us. In Beldman's discussion of narrative, he points out that our individual and communal stories are foundations of our identity. The stories in the Bible are really the story of the whole world and therefore it does behoove us to translate them, thus directly affecting the identity formation of people groups worldwide. The scriptures answer "Who are we? Where did we come from? What is wrong? What is the solution?"⁴⁶ Translating this message using foreign forms would diminish if not obliterate the very idea that this God is their God much less that they are his people. Translations done without the local people and/or not in readily understandable natural forms, are sitting on shelves unused. On the other hand, local speakers of the Dan language when listing the good things that happen when they use their own language included such things like it empowers, unifies, gives identity, and builds self-esteem and dignity.⁴⁷

If the translation model of contextual theology rings true, then the lexical and discourse forms of a translation of the gospel are simply vehicles for an unchanged Gospel message.⁴⁸ One should not be overly concerned if the form of the receptor language does not follow the original source text. In fact, one should be concerned about finding a form that changes the message as little as possible in the receptor language.

⁴⁶ Beldman, "Literary Approaches," 75.

⁴⁷ Becky Grossmann and Samuel Cooper. *Dan Sociolinguistic Survey July 12-19, 2012*. (Unpublished Manuscript, 2012), 10.

⁴⁸ Bevans, *Models*, 37.

Languages simply do not have a one-to-one correspondence either lexically, figuratively, or in discourse features whether these be markers or genres. “Word-for-word translation and the consistency principle are, however, the result of misunderstandings of the nature of language and of the translation process itself. The results of such emphases tend to be wooden and foreign sounding.”⁴⁹ As Eugene Nida and Charles Tabor conclude, a translation of the Bible should not only provide information but present the message in a way that people perceive its relevance and can respond to it accordingly.⁵⁰ The message should be presented in the contextual setting of the receiving group in such a way that they identify with it, that it is indeed God’s message for them. The use of ancient forms, of proverbs, and storytelling speaks to a God who values the identity of his audiences. A translation that uses the local forms of discourse in skilled ways will help communicate that underlying message of the Scriptures where the God of the universe values his creation so much that he seeks to be known and to be made known to all nations.

God did use various forms of communication, verbal and non-verbal. He delivered it in a variety of ways: through people, nature, and supernaturally. He delivered it in various languages to many people groups. He used various genres. Beyond that he desires his communication to reach all people. He gives this task to human beings. Translating God’s Word for future generations and for other nations continues the process seen in the Scriptures themselves. The words and forms in Scripture along with the actions of God recorded through the prophets, through the apostles, and through Jesus

⁴⁹ Charles Kraft, *Christianity in Culture: A Study in Dynamic Biblical Theologizing in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1979), 295-296, quoted in Stephen B. Bevans *Models*, 38.

⁵⁰ Bevans, *Models*, 39.

support modern day proclamation of the Gospel through translations using culturally and linguistically appropriate forms.

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section will review literature concerning the use of natural discourse forms in translation and how it effects meaning, comprehension, and receptivity. Some space will be given to examine the challenges related to finding the natural forms in receptor languages and to examine the challenges of using those natural forms in translation particularly of the Bible and the ramifications of doing so.

While much material is written defining texts, their various components, and what constitutes equivalence in translation, this review will focus more narrowly on resources that address translation and translation training concerning discourse structures. The focus will be on literature that speaks to how to train translators to recognize and use forms both lexical and contextual where the goal is to preserve the source text meaning and possibly some source forms in the production of a natural sounding receptor text of the Bible which is both understood and acceptable to receptor audiences.

The Nature of Texts and Translation

One barrier to quality in Bible translation is a tendency for translators to translate literally from their primary source text. This is a hazard for any translator but has particular relevance in the case of Mother-Tongue Translators (MTTs) with minimal training, who are bearing an increasingly larger role in new Bible translations around the globe.¹

¹ Michael Cahill and Keith Benn. "Overliteralness and Mother-Tongue Translators," *Journal of Translation* 7, no.1 (2011): 49.

In their abstract, Cahill and Benn sum up the challenge to quality faced by Bible translation projects around the world.² The problem is a tendency toward a literal translation. In their article “‘literal’ refers to very closely following the grammatical structure and vocabulary of the source language in the receptor language translation.”³ Literalness happens for three reasons: a natural tendency in the process of translation, respect for the Word, and an unawareness of natural receptor language patterns. They go on to illustrate this “overliteralness” at various levels in the text such as lexical, syntactic, typological, and literary. These categories coincide with the categories examined by other authors investigating source language interference which will be addressed later in this review. Cahill and Benn give real life examples of each translation problem they discuss illustrating how the meaning gets skewed or the text is rendered unacceptable by the audience. For example, where discourse markers were ignored “the translation sounded childish and unbelievable.”⁴ They also address non-structural components of meaning such as implied or implicit information and emotional impact. Where the translators don’t know the culture, the text tends to get literal. Their proposed solution coincides with the works reviewed under the heading of Translator Training and Text Analysis below.

Many MTTs have not had the opportunity to study their own language. When telling a story spontaneously, they automatically invoke rich vocabulary, use natural discourse structure, and use direct and indirect quotations and rhetorical questions appropriately. But these are below the level of consciousness. When they translate, their attention is on the structure and precise words of the SL. Unless they have been specifically made aware of how their language operates, they will not think that the function of the SL text can be equivalently expressed in the RL by modifying a structure or replacing a phrase with a single word. MTTs often don’t realize that it is even an option....One solution seems to be

² I have chosen to include the Cahill and Benn article here rather than in the section on training because they so clearly state the problems along with recommended solutions. Their work is not a course book for training.

³ Cahill and Benn, “Overliteralness,” 50.

⁴ Cahill and Benn, “Overliteralness,” 54.

catching on in recent years: a combined linguistics/translation workshop. In this type of workshop, participants investigate the structures of their languages, then deliberately apply this new knowledge to Scripture translation—on the spot.⁵

In their book *The Translator as Communicator*, Hatim and Mason offer more information that undergirds the nature of texts not being words strung together, but many parts inter-relating to make the whole. They stress that translation does not begin with the first word. Translation needs to start by looking at the whole text, going down to the parts, and then going back out to the whole. They look at what a particular word does for the whole text.⁶ In their discussion they show how a word choice can set the whole scene from focus to genre.⁷ Their example of a word choice between “pre-Columbian” versus “pre-Montezuma” marks a particular text as coming from a European perspective and thus carries with it a different set of expectations and understanding on many levels.

Hatim and Mason define translation as “an act of communication which attempts to relay, across cultural and linguistic boundaries, another act of communication (which may have been intended for different purposes and different readers/hearers).”⁸ Thus, the main emphasis in their book is that many factors affect how a text will be comprehended and these factors interrelate to produce the communication. According to them, any text is formulated based on socio-cultural and socio-textual factors.⁹ As just illustrated in the single word example above, what might be considered just a lexical factor is really a factor of the whole text.

⁵ Cahill and Benn, “Overliteralness,” 57, 60.

⁶ Basil Hatim and Ian Mason. *The Translator as Communicator* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 13.

⁷ Hatim and Mason, *The Translator as Communicator*, 20.

⁸ Hatim and Mason, *The Translator as Communicator*, 1.

⁹ Hatim and Mason, *The Translator as Communicator*, 18.

Hatim and Mason stress that translators must be able to perceive the intentions in the structures and words being used in the original even if not stated directly. Other factors to consider include situationality, intentionality, cohesion, coherence, and intertextuality. Their examples of the translation of an American editorial and the differences between the preferred argument structures of Arabic and English clearly illustrated the types of misunderstandings that can occur when the translator misses the overall message contained in the structures apart from the lexical items.¹⁰ Translators can get all the lower level structures correct and even get lexical items seemingly correct, but convey an entirely different message or a wrong message because they missed the clues at different levels. Where translators stumble in translation and in getting across the right sense or function is in the ability to recognize the text type.¹¹

In their role as mediators, translators deal with elements of meaning that can and often will lie above the level of propositional content and beyond the level of the sentence. As we have seen, meanings of this kind emanate from a variety of sources including the register membership of the text, intentionality and intertextuality.¹²

The translation manual by Hill, Gutt, Hill, Unger and Floyd also acknowledges the texts of Scripture as communication, communication from God.¹³ In that light they can proceed to approach the translation task as an act of communication possible in all languages. Like Hatim and Mason, they conclude that communication must be connected to other information we already know, or it will not be understood.¹⁴ Text types and genres also communicate expectations and meaning. According to Hill et al., genres

¹⁰ Hatim and Mason, *The Translator as Communicator*, 128.

¹¹ Basil Hatim and Ian Mason. *Discourse and the Translator* (New York: Longman, 1990), 161.

¹² Hatim and Mason, *The Translator as Communicator*, 111.

¹³ Harriet Hill, Ernst-August Gutt, Margaret Hill, Christoph Unger, and Rick Floyd. *Bible Translation Basics: Communicating Scripture in a Relevant Way* (Dallas: SIL International, 2011), 3.

¹⁴ Hill et al., *Bible Translation Basics*, 22.

guide expectations about the communication forthcoming. People will have expectations about how the translated text of the Bible should look. They state that Bible translation is a genre itself.¹⁵

In his essay “The notion of genre and the nature of Bible translations,” DeVries calls Bible translation a macrogenre which then has other genres within it. He determines it as its own genre because of three factors. The first is that the Bible text functions in a relatively new context of the Christian community. At least this was true in Irian Jaya at the time he wrote the article. Secondly, the Biblical text is a secondary text. The fact cannot be hidden that it is foreign because of the historical and cultural information it contains which are obviously different from the receptor culture. The third factor is the written nature of the text in mostly oral societies.¹⁶

In “Duna is not Greek,” Giles writes of comprehension drops where Duna discourse features are not used.¹⁷ This was particularly evident in the linkage system practices. Where Duna linkage was not used, comprehension diminished. Referents need to be unfocussed in Duna texts when they are no longer relevant. Readers would have extra questions where this was not done, such as what happened to the angel in the story of Zechariah when the text shifted to focus on Zechariah. Not “disposing” of the angel distracted from the forward motion of the text, leaving the readers stuck. The arrangement of logical binaries must follow local practice.¹⁸ Reason must follow result

¹⁵ Hill et al., *Bible Translation Basics*, 108.

¹⁶ De Vries, Lourens. "The notion of genre and the nature of Bible translations," *Notes on Translation-Summer Institute Of Linguistics* 13 (1999): 3.

¹⁷ Glenda Giles, "Duna is not Greek, but how far can one go?," *The Bible Translator-Practical Papers* 23, no. 4 (1972): 406.

¹⁸ Giles, “Duna is not Greek,” 408. Hatim and Mason agree with this as they discussed the use of the through versus counter-point argument structures as one goes from Arabic to English. The use of various structures and logical arrangements does affect meaning and comprehension.

meaning that many texts must be rearranged. Giles gives many good examples in her article of how text structures come with expectations already built in and these expectations help the audience understand. When the expectations are not met, misunderstanding results.

In Phil Stine's response to Giles (located in Giles), he states that it is accepted practice to restructure at sentence level. It seems people are still getting used to doing that at a higher level. Restructuring of this sort requires a thorough knowledge of source and target structures. Stine cautions that sometimes these target text structures are formed from only a small representation of the vast possibilities. Perhaps the discovery of this limited analysis limits the translators unnecessarily. He suggests that translators must be aware of the discourse features of their language and so training beyond sentence level is essential which then demands a thorough analysis of both source and receptor textual features. Dynamic equivalence translation can be applied to levels above the sentence.¹⁹

Dooley's findings and recommendations as relayed in his essay "Relevance theory and discourse analysis: Complementary approaches for translator training" are reinforced by the above examples. He states, "The same structure, form, or linguistic pattern does not have the same communicative function in the receptor language as it does in the source text."²⁰ He further states, "There are also reasons why translators need a conscious understanding of discourse issues, beyond the linguistic intuitions that serve so well in the production of natural receptor language discourse."²¹ In addition to the functional mismatches already mentioned is another reason to train in discourse structures

¹⁹ See Phil Stine's response to Giles, in Giles, "Duna is not Greek," 411.

²⁰ Dooley, Robert A. "Relevance theory and discourse analysis: Complementary approaches for translator training," *GIA LENS*, (3) (2008): 2.

²¹ Dooley, "Relevance theory," 1.

is that it is difficult for translators to recognize when source discourse features are being copied. He recommends training workshops to focus on the mismatches between the source and receptor languages.

Dooley helps reveal where Relevance Theory (RT) and discourse analysis (DA) intersect. The latter in its narrow sense deals with text-internal context while RT focuses on both text-internal and external context. Structures are used to communicate a meaning, but these structures vary from language to language. He gives examples on the use of connectives and how different languages provide cohesion with different placement of their connectives. He also addresses participant reference and themes. Keeping track of participants and making a theme clear are language specific and “translators need to know how to use them.”²² He also demonstrates how language typology coincides with differences in the presentation of theme and supporting material and the order of focus structures. To avoid unnecessary processing effort on the part of a hearer, these structures need to be addressed.²³

Dooley says that initially the lower level adjustments to a text are made as the translation draft is first composed. Then with each later pass the discourse features can be incorporated. According to him, discourse features often take a conscious effort to employ thus the reason that native speakers must study the discourse features of their language. It is cognitively difficult to focus on large scale patterns at the same time as the smaller scale features. Discourse rules are not as rigid and require more awareness and

²² Dooley, “Relevance theory,” 6.

²³ Levinsohn says the same. Certain logical relations are reversed in languages that follow an SOV pattern from those that follow SVO. See Stephen H. Levinsohn, “Checking translations for discourse features,” *Journal of Translation* (2006): 24.

flexibility in applying them. Lower level mismatches are more readily apparent and so get attention first.²⁴

Translator Training and Text Analysis

Where does one begin with translator training? A much loved and standard training manual is that by Barnwell.²⁵ While Barnwell does not ignore the higher-level markings in a text, her initial focus is on handling the lower-level textual concerns like idioms, known and unknown ideas, explicit information, implicit information, etc. She includes chapters on discovering culture and grammar, but the focus of the text is on the lower-level structures as already mentioned. This is more of a bottom up approach to training. In a footnote, Wendland suggests augmenting Barnwell's book with text-genre and pragmatic features.²⁶ The basic outline and chapters of her manual give focus to the lower level pieces. Discourse/grammar analysis is not in the forefront. These areas are not her starting place.

Bible Translation Basics by Hill, Gutt, Hill, Unger and Floyd is an instruction manual that emphasizes Relevance Theory. As previously mentioned, the authors start by looking at translation as communication and begin with ideas such as understanding, cognitive benefits, ease of processing, connections to other information outside of the text, various contexts and concepts. In contrast to Barnwell, theirs is a top-down approach. This book gives a lot of the framework over to the bigger picture of the environment, expectations, who is involved, and the purpose of various scripture

²⁴ Dooley, "Relevance theory," 8-9.

²⁵ Katharine Barnwell, *Bible Translation: An Introductory Course in Translation Principles* (Dallas: SIL International, 2002).

²⁶ Ernst R. Wendland, "On the Relevance of 'Relevance Theory' for Bible Translation," *The Bible Translator* 47, no.1 (2006): 134.

products. They stress awareness of context of the text and the context of the translator, audience, and original authors.²⁷

Hatim and Mason's *The Translator as Communicator* also stresses context. "The mishandling of context by trainee translators resulted in a flawed performance in which all aspects of textuality suffered" while at the same time "the output was fluent and almost faultless in terms of lexis and grammar."²⁸ They give an example of a letter to the editor by an American. Middle Eastern translators got the message completely turned around as a result of not understanding the form and perhaps also because the content was so foreign and outside their context. Translators need to know how a contextual form is used in the source language (SL) and whether it can be used in the same way in the receptor language (RL). "When context is misinterpreted, then, both structure and texture are invariably at risk."²⁹ They conclude that translator training must include an examination of discursal-type errors. Training must include text typology with its subcategories such as differing structures of argumentation and also register variables which include technical/non-technical, subjective/objective, and spoken/written features. They recommend training on various discourse types, unmarked, marked, and hybrids of the types. People might have a very good handle on the structures and grammar of a language, but they must have training in matching of the structures to various contexts and what meaning the combination gives. Their focus seems to be on knowing the source language features well.³⁰

²⁷ Hill et al., *Bible Translation Basics*.

²⁸ Hatim and Mason, *The Translator as Communicator*, 168.

²⁹ Hatim and Mason, *The Translator as Communicator*, 176.

³⁰ Hatim and Mason, *The Translator as Communicator*, 179-180.

Wendland, on the other hand, wrote three articles in sequence addressing some issues of training translators to be natural under the title “Receptor Language Style and Bible Translation.” In the first article,³¹ he points out that much of the Bible translator training materials and helps focus on the source text issues and what translators actually need is more help and guidance on the receptor language usage. He refers to Loewen’s and Stine’s works discussed below which give guidance on how to study RL natural features. Wendland is quite adamant in his recommendation for receptor language study. He states, “Unless translators are given adequate opportunity to analyze the artistic and expressive features of their own language, too much will be left to chance... there should be a thorough study of the chief rhetorical and artistic devices in the RL.”³² He does caution though that not every oral device is appropriate for use in the written texts and that texts will need extensive testing.³³ He then goes on to mention particular areas of discourse to pay attention to in reference to style such as the use of quotations and dialogue, use of figurative language and description, and ideophones.

In the third article of his series "Receptor Language Style and Bible Translation. III: Training Translators about Style,"³⁴ Wendland offers training principles and practice. In contrast to Dooley’s recommendation, Wendland advocates that the stylist should be involved from the very start. This article in the series tackles the topic of training translators about style and the larger discourse features of text. He says,

It is imperative that basic instruction with regard to matters of style be given to (prospective) translators and reviewers at the very first training institute, certainly

³¹ Ernst R. Wendland, "Receptor Language Style and Bible Translation: A Search for ‘Language Which Grabs the Heart,’" *The Bible Translator* 32, no. 1 (1981): 107-124.

³² Wendland, "Receptor Language Style," 109.

³³ Wendland, "Receptor Language Style," 110.

³⁴ Ernst R. Wendland, "Receptor Language Style and Bible Translation. III: Training Translators about Style," *The Bible Translator* 33, no. 1 (1982): 115-127

before any serious work on the Bible is begun. Style is not a jam that can be smoothly spread on after the bread is buttered-it must be applied right from the start of the translation project.³⁵

He also recommends that translator candidates be screened for aptitude in their abilities to use proper receptor language style. Such a candidate is to be favored over an “expert” exegete who may be a barrier to a dynamic translation.³⁶ The rest of his article is a description of various exercises needed to reinforce both the principles of using RL discourse features as well as how to go about discovering and using them well. The essay is not an actual training manual but does offer some structures under which a course could be developed. Such a course would be very comprehensive and language specific. He encourages analysis which includes lower level as well as discourse level discovery along with comparison so translators can see what different meanings arise out of different structures.³⁷ He offers processes to discover, compare, and practice using the discourse features and styles of the receptor language as well as diagnose, test, and correct problems.³⁸ In addition, he proposes some strategies and competencies for the instructors of such a course.³⁹

Another top-down approach is found in Culy’s article “The Top-Down Approach to Translation.”⁴⁰ He seeks to introduce a methodology for the mother-tongue translator to use his intuitive language knowledge. It has less focus on translation theory and principles found in other training resources. He distinguishes the differences between an acquired language translator (ALT) and the native speaker. The bottom-up approach is

³⁵ Wendland, "Receptor Language Style III," 116.

³⁶ Wendland, "Receptor Language Style III," 115.

³⁷ Wendland, "Receptor Language Style III," 116-118.

³⁸ Wendland, "Receptor Language Style III," 118-123.

³⁹ Wendland, "Receptor Language Style III," 123-125.

⁴⁰ Martin Culy, “The Top-Down Approach to Translation,” *Notes on Translation* 7, no 3 (1993): 28-51.

more beneficial for the ALT because it compensates for his lack of language intuition. Many of the principles were designed to help the foreigner overcome his language weaknesses. However, such an approach neglects the training of a native speaker. When the mother-tongue translator is trained, Culy advises against working from a written source text, but rather work from an oral explanation of the text. The idea is that this will avoid the interferences in language and structure a written source text might cause. Training involves practicing the development of a rough natural draft from an oral explanation. Meaning is internalized and either written down freely in natural language structures or delivered orally. He emphasizes the oral method in early training. His methodologies include writing practice in the mother-tongue to expose the differences of genre, to help the translator learn to express meaning in an understandable way and to develop skills in transferring meaning particularly of unknown ideas. Basic translation principles should still be taught but he lists a smaller subset and emphasizes that such training is to heighten the translator's knowledge of his own language rather than a way to transfer source language structures. Exegesis remains strongly in the hands of an exegete and not the translator at least for the rough draft which is all done orally. Written drafts come only after a satisfactory oral draft is selected.

Loewen's contribution to translator training recognizes that many of those involved in Bible translation have received literary and writing training only in the language of their education. Thus, they favor that language's patterns and devices.⁴¹ His article "Training Translators to Write in Their Own Language" proposes a very specific workshop where participants write essays about some experience in their own language.

⁴¹ Jacob A. Loewen, "Training Translators to Write in Their Own Language," *The Bible Translator* 30, no. 2 (1979): 224-225.

These essays are then viewed and discussed by the class pointing out various good and bad points. Connectors, tone, character development, and flashbacks are several of the features highlighted. As students read and evaluate the essays, they then rewrite them attempting to incorporate the good features discussed and make the essays better. The stories can be rewritten any number of ways to help develop other genres such as make-believe or telling the stories from different viewpoints. His basic premise is that better writers make better translators. They will become aware of focus, various literary devices and features of their own language and how to use them. They will approach translation more like an original production than a copy of something from a source text.⁴²

In “Translators and Texts,” Stine begins with the recognition that even though translators may read the source text in its entirety, they still tend to translate verse by verse. As he points out, languages do not function in such short units, but ideas, clauses and sentences are grouped together and are related to form a unit called a text. The features that link sentences together are not easily recognized or used if sentences are analyzed in isolation. Equivalence can be lost in the unnaturalness of a string of sentences with incorrect cohesive devices.⁴³ He points out several examples from Wolof in Senegal concerning natural language features that will be totally missed in a literal translation from the English.

Stine proceeds to outline the types of workshops he conducts to discover the natural RL discourse features. He has recorded texts collected from a variety of sources and speakers transcribed, back translated, and some preliminary analysis done particularly on elements of cohesion. The workshop itself discusses a set of kernel

⁴² Loewen, "Training Translators," 230.

⁴³ Philip C. Stine, "Translators and Texts," *The Bible Translator* 29, no.3 (1979): 301.

sentences from the viewpoint of the language of instruction and from the viewpoint of the receptor language looking at such factors as order of information, focus, participants, and style. Then participants write a story based on the kernels and the discussion. He then examines the recorded natural texts and has the participants practice translating selected scripture portions. He plays the recorded texts several times asking workshop participants to look for features pertaining to opening, closing, setting, transitions, quotations, focus, etc. This is all done orally. The oral texts may facilitate analysis considering these are oral cultures and often people of limited education. The drawback would be the time factor listening to the recordings. After determining the features used in the natural stories, the translators take biblical texts and write out kernel sentences for the entire passage from which they make a translation applying the RL features just discussed. He has specific texts he uses with specific features to focus on. His method helps translators recognize natural RL structures, but also that they need to translate from the entire passage.⁴⁴

Carson makes the case that both the SL features and RL features must be made known to those doing Bible translation in his article “The Limits of Dynamic Equivalence in Bible Translation.”⁴⁵ This article does not address workshops and their results so much as giving argument to meaning and message. While he favors dynamic equivalence, he has some cautions about taking translation too far out of the linguistic realm and too far away from the source text in order to enculturate the text and/or eliminate the need for pastors and evangelists. In other words, our translation should not

⁴⁴ Stine, “Translators and Texts,” 306.

⁴⁵ Donald A. Carson, “The Limits of Dynamic Equivalence in Bible Translation,” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 9 (1985): 200-213.

be burdened with having to include explanation in the text or paratext for every question that might arise.

The contribution Carson makes for this project is his strong stance on knowledge of both receptor and source language features. Features such as frequencies of forms, connotative meanings, and the significance of style are taken very seriously coinciding with authors such as Grimes (discussed later) who have given significance to and tools for measuring or counting various linguistic features.⁴⁶ Translator trainees should not be led to believe that this workshop will catch all the pitfalls, but their abilities might be further advanced should they have comparative knowledge of the features of both source and receptor texts.

Carson cautions against moving away too far from historical and cultural features of the source.⁴⁷ This caution might be applied to the stylistic structures as well, possibly more so in poetic features than narrative features. In any event, studying the features and knowing them gives the translator choices that perhaps would have been missed in the dynamic where source texts tend to control structures in a translation situation.

In his article "Contrastive Discourse Pragmatics and Translation: With Implications for Training," Watters also recognizes that while certain features appear to be working on a lower level in the text, their impact on the discourse level needs recognition.⁴⁸ He also recognizes that translators may have difficulty recognizing their own linguistic features where translation is a new practice and where the source text is so

⁴⁶ Joseph Grimes, "Measuring 'Naturalness' in a Translation," *The Bible Translator* 14, no.2 (1963): 49-62.

⁴⁷ Carson, "The Limits of Dynamic Equivalence," 209.

⁴⁸ James K. Watters, "Contrastive Discourse Pragmatics and Translation: With Implications for Training," *The Bible Translator* 51, no. 1 (2000): 125.

revered as is the case in Bible translation.⁴⁹ For example, he argues that semantically a tense-aspect system might match between languages and is easy to do so on a sentence level. But their use on the discourse level can be quite different between languages. Sentences may not string together in coherent ways if the grammatically correct sentence-level tense-aspect is copied from the source to the target.

Watters does not write a training manual such as Barnwell and Hill et al., but he draws attention to various topics a training course should contain. These include the ideas of inference, predictability, decisions on what to make explicit, use of repetition and other stylistic features, topic, focus, matching SL features to RL features, participant reference, and how lower level grammatical features are used in a text. He proposes that the way to learn the RL features is from natural texts as we have seen from several of the authors already discussed.⁵⁰

He also addresses the element of oral text versus written and asks a good question: Can we trust oral texts to be a good model to determine structures of written texts? His response is that many features of oral structure are what make written structure easy to read and listen to. A text which does not have good flow will be evidenced by the reader pausing and stumbling, maybe refusing to read it.⁵¹ Readers get frustrated by sentences that are poorly constructed. Oral texts do provide a good model for both oral and written texts and translators should be trained to recognize the discourse structures and how to effectively use them for their various purposes.⁵²

⁴⁹ Watters, “Contrastive Discourse,” 124.

⁵⁰ Watters, “Contrastive Discourse,” 130.

⁵¹ Watters, “Contrastive Discourse,” 132-133.

⁵² Watters, “Contrastive Discourse,” 132-133.

Smith would agree with Watters that oral features can be used in the written literature. In her article "A search for naturalness in translated material," she distinguishes planned oral narration from unplanned. The planned is what should be studied to determine natural discourse markers. According to her, a story should be narrated at least six times to be considered planned.⁵³

Bartsch also addresses this question about oral versus written text features in her article "Oral Style, Written Style, and Bible Translation." She stresses the necessity of translating in such a way that the written text is "formal enough to meet people's expectations for written material in general and the Scriptures in particular yet informal enough to be easily understood and enjoyed when spoken or read aloud."⁵⁴ Written texts tend to have less repetition, use punctuation to replace some of the prosodic cues, are better organized, use fewer loan and archaic words and information flow can be denser. There is some intuition involved in what ultimately sounds natural or right according to Bartsch, but her training workshop is designed to bring this into conscious knowledge. A good translated text will have good flow. Bartsch emphasizes, "...those characteristics of oral style which make the Scriptures useful orally as well as when read silently need to be incorporated."⁵⁵

Halme-Berneking in "Helping Bible Translators Recognize Linguistic Interference between Angolan Bantu Languages and Portuguese,"⁵⁶ wrote specifically on

⁵³ Joan Smith, "A search for naturalness in translated material," *SIL-Mexico Workpapers* 9 (1987): 103.

⁵⁴ Carla Bartsch, "Oral Style, Written Style, and Bible Translation." *Notes on Translation* 11 (1997): 41. She describes specific oral and written text features in her training materials. See Bartsch, *Narrative Discourse Workshop*, (Unpub. MS), 9.

⁵⁵ Bartsch, "Oral Style," 2.

⁵⁶ Riikka Halme-Berneking, "Helping Bible Translators Recognize Linguistic Interference between Angolan Bantu Languages and Portuguese," *The Bible Translator* 65, no. 3 (2014): 353-368, accessed June 21, 2017, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2051677014553550>.

the evidence of interference from the source text structures in the receptor texts in Angola translation projects. The situation in Angola sounds very similar to the situation in Liberia except involving different languages. Several texts in Portuguese provide the source for the translation projects there. She describes several ways that translators err in relation to allowing interference from the Portuguese texts. These recurring interferences are common in texts translated by bilinguals. Translators err by not incorporating the linguistic features unique or common in the RL. She points out that natural features that are missing in the SL will likely be missing in the translation unless translators are taught about them and taught to use them. Other features which are straightforward equivalents show up too much.⁵⁷

Several factors influence the interference and a tendency to follow the SL too closely. One is the prestige of Portuguese. Interference is almost an expectation.⁵⁸. Another factor is the fact that most of the bilingual translators have only studied grammar in the SL as Loewen also pointed out. Grammatical categories are imposed on Bantu forms even though they don't really match. While translating, error occurs when one tries to match a Bantu word to the SL form word when there is a mismatch. She gives an example of the use of prepositions in Portuguese where the Bantu equivalent is not a preposition but a locative noun-class prefix.⁵⁹ Elsewhere the Bantu prefer to use markers on verbs to track participants while Portuguese uses pronouns.

She cites a lack of a corpus of language data to study as what prevents translators from taking counts of the forms they use and so assess whether such forms are showing

⁵⁷ Halme-Berneking, "Helping Bible Translators," 356.

⁵⁸ Halme-Berneking, "Helping Bible Translators," 356.

⁵⁹ Halme-Berneking, "Helping Bible Translators," 358.

up in natural frequency ranges.⁶⁰ The main area of interference is where there is a mismatch at either lower-level or higher-level structures. The mismatch tends to be translated into the RL language literally, resulting in unnatural forms.

Her solution to this problem is allowing translators to discover the mismatches. They are recognized by the unnatural sound they have in a translated text.⁶¹ Discovery is made when translators are allowed to talk about situations naturally. Their own forms are discovered and now translators recognize where they need to be used in translated texts and that it is okay to use the natural form. Such training increases the capabilities of the translators. If these discoveries are made in a workshop setting, the various groups can learn from each other.

Blackburn also uses a variation of the natural setting to illustrate different text features. He calls his method “Contextual adjustment.”⁶² He takes several English translations – NASB and NLT – and contrasts them with two contemporary situations illustrated in the style and forms of the NASB and NLT. These contemporary illustrations are meant to get the translator away from the text which may be all too familiar in the source language and get him/her to consider the type of language used through a more common every day situation.

The problem with interference is that “nobody can specify where exactly the boundary between interference and an accurate (but correct) translation lies.”⁶³ In her master’s thesis, Havlášková concurs with Halme-Berneking that interference is a

⁶⁰ Halme-Berneking, “Helping Bible Translators,” 359.

⁶¹ Halme-Berneking, “Helping Bible Translators,” 364.

⁶² Perry L. Blackburn, “Contextual adjustment as a tool for teaching naturalness in translation,” *Jott* 15 (2003): 58.

⁶³ Zuzana Havlášková, “Interference in Students’ Translations” (master’s thesis, Masaryk University Department of English and American Studies, 2010), 8.

common problem and is often tolerated when the SL culture is considered prestigious.⁶⁴

While it would seem like mother-tongue speakers would naturally use their language's natural structures, "translations show that this is not always the case."⁶⁵ The amount of interference depends on the proficiency of a translator. An increase in awareness of the RL structures decreases the amount of interference.⁶⁶ The heart of Havlásková's thesis examines student texts and classifies the interferences found. She categorizes them according to lexical, syntactic, grammatical, and typographical. Both the type of text and the style of the ST seem to have an impact on the number of interferences. While interference is mainly seen as indicative of poor translation, some authors do contend that at times retaining some source text features is preferable. At times, readers desire knowing a text has been translated.⁶⁷ This, however, should be purposeful as directed in a style document and not the result of uninformed translation.

In addition to the translation training manuals and articles already surveyed, several training manuals for discourse study were reviewed. Bartsch's material came in the form of a Word document personalized for Liberia.⁶⁸ She walks through topics such as communication situation, storyline, participant reference, use of quotations, honorifics, peak, theme, and connectors. The course is set up so that natural texts in the MTTs languages are placed in charts for analysis. As each topic is covered, that feature is found in the natural texts. Then a comparison of a previously translated and charted Bible story

⁶⁴ Havlásková, "Interference," 9.

⁶⁵ Havlásková, "Interference," 11. Halme-Berneking accounted for interference mainly where there was a mismatch in structures.

⁶⁶ Havlásková, "Interference," 13, 23, 34. While Bartsch does not focus on interference in her work, she too emphasizes a knowledge of natural forms so that the translators will know to use them and not follow the ST structures so closely, thus avoiding the interference observed here.

⁶⁷ Havlásková, "Interference," 17.

⁶⁸ Carla Bartsch, *Narrative Discourse Workshop*, (Unpub. MS, July 24, 2017).

is analyzed for the same feature. She includes discussion, write-ups, and tables for translators to record their findings. Her focus is comparing the features found in the natural texts with how the translations were done in those same places of the storyline. Counts, similarities at storyline boundaries and paragraphs as well as quotation formulas are all compared. Ideally, enough natural texts would be available to examine all the features over a corpus of literature, so that norms could be established and from there the translations could be evaluated and revised. She does not go looking for interference or categorize it, but assumes it is happening. Some interference is discovered in the comparisons of natural and translated text. Those structures that follow the English but are already used in the natural texts do not have to be in focus. Those areas where features differ were what were called to attention. Her focus in her workshop materials is on becoming aware of the RL features in order to use them. Recognizing where the translator is being a slave to the SL in areas of form may be a secondary result of her method.

Bartsch's premises are summed up in her paper "Life Transforming Translations."⁶⁹ Here she states that translators can be trained to be natural and to use natural discourse features if they are made aware of them. Like Halme-Berneking and Havlášková, she also states that translators will follow the patterns of the SL if they are not made aware of their own patterns. She uses group discussions to foster more discovery and acceptance of natural forms.

⁶⁹ Carla Bartsch, "Life-transforming Translations: How can we Teach Translators with Limited Education to Produce Natural-sounding Translations of the Scriptures," *Bible Translation Conference 2015 DVD: Bible Translation and Transformation* (Dallas:Graduate Institute for Applied Linguistics, 2015): 1.

Nicolle's training material focusses on Acts 16:16-40.⁷⁰ Like Bartsch, his starting point is with narrative text. However, he recommends getting a much longer natural text and more of them from several narrators. This gives more data from which to draw conclusions. Each chapter covers a particular feature and then has a discovery section and a section for translator practical application. Then he shows that feature in the Acts passage. The discourse topic is applied first to the natural texts and secondly to this portion of Acts. Nicolle's focus is to get the translators to see the features in the ST and then apply the appropriate natural feature in the translation.

I have found that the most successful workshops have been those where discourse analysis has been combined with translation practice. When translators study discourse features in their own languages and in biblical texts, and then apply what they have just learned directly to translation, they are able to see (and hear) their translations improve.⁷¹

His findings agree with Halme-Berneking where the RL might not have a feature or has a different structure, translators will try to borrow from the SL or use patterns that are not the natural ones. The key to stopping this is translator awareness.

"Because of the differences between languages, it is important for translators to know what choice of referring expressions is available in the source language and in the target language, and what the function of each referring expression is. A translator must use a referring expression in the target language that has a similar function to the referring expression in the source language, even if the form is different."⁷²

Nicolle makes it very clear as he defines, describes, and demonstrates the use of various discourse markers and their purposes, that each language has a system for their

⁷⁰ Steve Nicolle, "Narrative Discourse Analysis and Bible Translation: Training Materials Based on Acts 16:16-40," *SIL Publications* (2017): accessed June 22, 2017, <https://www.sil.org/resources/publications/entry/69386>.

⁷¹ Nicolle, "Narrative Discourse Analysis," 5. He doesn't use the charts like Bartsch. Her analysis of the Mark texts used for the workshop started with a chart where the storyline was already marked. However, she approaches the Bible texts from the translated text already in the local language and not the source language.

⁷² Nicolle, "Narrative Discourse Analysis," 31.

use and that these systems and structures communicate meaning. He shares many examples from various languages showing how they differ from the SL. In so doing, he helps trigger ideas for other languages and empowers them to appreciate the differences found in their own languages. None of the translation manuals did comparative analysis with translated texts following the workshops.

Dooley and Levinsohn wrote a discourse analysis manual together which covers the basics.⁷³ It is a manual for field linguists and gives basics of discourse analysis. It could possibly be adapted for use with MTTs. The underlining assumption is that such training will help produce more natural translation when the natural discourse features are discovered. This is not a translation manual, however. The same applies to the manual Levinsohn wrote entitled *Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis*.⁷⁴ He details how to go about analyzing narrative discourse in texts and gives information on general findings based on typology. He also includes a tool for recording the findings according to universal categories of discourse features found in most languages. This latter tool can be used by consultants to help translators use their natural features and evaluate naturalness as it records their patterns under each discourse feature topic.

Evaluation of Texts as Evaluation of Training

Hatim and Mason in *The Translator as Communicator* address texts, translation, and training in a holistic manner. Hatim and Mason recommend that translators be evaluated in the areas of linguistics, semantics, and pragmatics. A range of possible

⁷³ Robert A. Dooley and Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Analyzing discourse: A manual of basic concepts* (Dallas: SIL International. 2001).

⁷⁴ Stephen H. Levinsohn, Introduction to ‘Discourse for Translation’ Files: Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis.” *Stephen H. Levinsohn*. 2015. <http://www-01.sil.org/~levinsohns/narr.pdf> (accessed August 15, 2016).

choices should be acknowledged and the choices evaluated based on the skopos of the assignment. Inversion of meaning, omission, addition, deviation and modification should be noted.⁷⁵

In “What’s the Difference?” Wendland delves into testing the translation among the audience rather than just a document examination. He describes the challenges of doing this in Africa where life is done on a communal basis and finding the right questions is an impossible task. People want to give a careful answer, or they want to please. He resorted to a very subjective comparison of texts. He had three versions that he labeled functional equivalent (FE), popular language (PL), and formal correspondence (FC). From this it was easier for testers to talk about the differences rather than the similarities.⁷⁶ He admits to his methods being very subjective. Much of the evaluation had to be inferred from implicit types of reactions to the texts: interest, disinterest, exclamations, or evaluative asides. In general, in his testing, the FC was the most difficult to understand by about 70%. It was not deemed the most “beautiful”, but some thought it was “powerful” nonetheless. The FE version was the “sweetest” to listen to. But because of the poetic nature it still proved somewhat difficult to understand. The style was idiomatic, and this pleased many people.⁷⁷ His evaluation methods also serve to verify the use of oral discourse markers in texts as most people interact with Biblical texts

⁷⁵ Hatim and Mason, *The Translator as Communicator*, 202.

⁷⁶ Ernst R. Wendland, "What's the Difference? Similarity and Dissimilarity) from a Cross-Cultural Perspective: Some Reflections upon the Notion of 'Acceptability' in Bible Translation." In *Similarity and Difference in Translation: Proceedings of the International Conference on Similarity and Translation: Bible House New York City, May 31-June 1, 2001*, Vol. 1, ed. Stefano Arduini (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2007): 340.

⁷⁷ Wendland, "What's the Difference," 344-345.

aurally. “A translation in such areas must therefore be rendered in such a way that oral elocution and aural comprehension is facilitated.”⁷⁸

Another way to evaluate a text is given by Wendland’s second article in his series “Receptor Language Style and Bible Translation.”⁷⁹ He asks the question of how far one can make changes to form; what guidelines and limits are necessary when going from a source to a receptor text? He offers several suggestions quoting Fehderau and Loewen. Basically, one needs to use natural styles where it is necessary to avoid wrong, zero, or ambiguous meaning, and to avoid bad grammar and style in the RL. On the other hand, SL features should be maintained as much as possible where the biblical form might portray an historical fact or function as a teaching device, if it is a frequent symbol, or there is a focus on the form in the context. These sorts of questions could be used to help evaluate a translated text or help guide translators in their decision-making process. He proposes a continuum from literal to literary/idiomatic with the label “acceptable” falling in between. Translators must make decisions about where their translation will fall on that continuum based on their local context. He offers seven recommendations for regulating the restructuring of texts which could be used in translation training as well as evaluation. These are:

1. Naturalness must yield to accuracy.
2. There should be no semantic gain or loss.
3. Points 1 and 2 must be reviewed in the context of figurative literature.
4. Literary devices used should be familiar and not overly complex and difficult.
5. Literary embellishments must be appropriate.
6. Implicit information may be made explicit provided points 1 and 2 are not violated.

⁷⁸ Wendland, “What’s the Difference,” 343.

⁷⁹ Ernst R. Wendland, “Receptor Language Style and Bible Translation. II: The Problem of Control in Restructuring,” *The Bible Translator* 32, no. 3 (1981): 319-328.

7. The translation should attempt to match the literary level of the SL.⁸⁰

So, while these are good guidelines to follow and will assist the translators in both producing and evaluating their work, they are not a measure of comparison regarding the use of matching natural text features in translated work.

Grimes attempts to provide a tool to measure and compare features of grammar and style used in natural texts and those used in translated texts in his article “Measuring ‘Naturalness’ in a Translation.” He recognizes that something is needed more than just a translator’s feeling about the naturalness. Although he wrote the article years before Relevance Theory got off the ground, he says, “Any unnecessary difficulty imposed by the grammatical apparatus detracts from the impact of the message itself.”⁸¹ He recognizes the more effort the reader/hearer must give processing the text the less impact the message will have.

Grimes uses method of confidence intervals to compare things like sentence length and syntactic markers, clause configurations and types, noun phrases, verb types, borrowed words, etc. Translators must first be aware of the stylistic features of natural text and work to implement them into the translation. This method of counting only serves to confirm that features are used or not so adjustments can be made. This is a very quantitative approach to evaluation and should figures fall outside the range of the intervals, one can assume the translation will sound unnatural as opposed to methods which involve just listening and waiting for confusion or stumbling. Quantifying these countable features makes the translation work and revision a bit more objective than

⁸⁰ Wendland, "Receptor Language Style II", 324-327.

⁸¹ Grimes, “Measuring,” 49.

subjective and perhaps will give a translator the permission needed to add more of the natural features and not be so bound to the source text.⁸²

Dow Robinson made use of Grimes' tool and did a study of Aztec frequency counts. As he reports in "Native Texts and Frequency Counts as Aids to the Translator," he found several counts that were upside down in the sense that features found in natural text were not found in the translated text, or there were large numbers of a feature in the translated text that did not occur in the natural texts. These counts gave him some basic guidelines to follow as far as how many verbs should be used per clause or how many of certain types of particles should be used.⁸³ However, there was no instruction on which sentences would get the modification. For instance, if the guideline was that one in every five sentences should contain a certain marker, how does one know which sentence should have the marker. These counts seemed to be based at the sentence level, but that does not rule out that they may have an effect at a higher level.

In his dissertation "Functional Equivalent Translation of New Testament Hortatory Discourse into Hill Madia,"⁸⁴ Christopher Vaz presents an interesting study of discourse features in hortatory text. I present his work here because what he did presents a tool for translated biblical text evaluation although much of what he writes could be placed in both previous sections.

He basically does a private, extensive discourse analysis on hortatory texts comparing Galatians to Madia hortatory texts to find the key structures used in each.

⁸² Grimes, "Measuring," 55.

⁸³ Dow F. Robinson, "Native Texts and Frequency Counts as Aids to the Translator," *The Bible Translator* 14, no. 2 (1963):70-71.

⁸⁴ Christopher Augustin Vaz, "Functional Equivalent Translation of New Testament Hortatory Discourse into Hill Madia" (Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, School of Intercultural Studies, 2011).

Using a functionalist approach, he applies the discovered structures to a translation of Galatians, matching function for function. He does a brief evaluation of his successful transfer of function via the RL structures.

He did a very detailed study of both the Greek source text and a corpus of receptor language texts and then took the analysis and applied it throughout the translation. He describes a very detailed and academic process. His analysis and subsequent application go well beyond what our two-week workshop entailed, but what he does illustrates the benefits of analyzing natural texts and matching function structures from the RL with the appropriate places in the translated text.

Vaz brings up the difficulty of doing such study and gaining the mastery of both SL and RL by the normal translator teams. He wants to see a top-down processing approach explored as emphasized earlier by Culy, Hatim and Mason, and others instead of the verse-by-verse approach that tends to ignore author intent and purpose. He proposes the SL texts be analyzed per his model. If translators have access to such a resource, then they can analyze their languages and apply the RL functional equivalent. Consultants would be aware to be looking for how the SL functional devices were translated into the RL. Typological issues such as order of propositions could be made clear.⁸⁵

He favors workshops such as what we are doing. Someone comes in with knowledge of the source texts and has them analyzed. Then the translators get opportunity to apply their natural text analysis to RL translations.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Vaz, “Functional equivalent translation,” 331.

⁸⁶ Vaz, “Functional equivalent translation,” 332.

He includes one subjective evaluation of the text via a Madia speaker who helped clean up his work. This native speaker did not change the discourse features the author had applied. His other evaluation took place by counting features and providing percentages of how successfully a match was made and realized in the receptor text.⁸⁷

Summary

From these key pieces of literature, we have learned that translation of texts involves much more than translating vocabulary and SL structures directly into the RL. Texts operate on many levels as do the features from which they are made. Even vocabulary can signal a larger contextual meaning than just what is contained in its denotative value. Because of this, writers such as Cahill and Benn, Hatim and Mason, Dooley, Bartsch, and others strongly recommend that translators be taught about their language and be taught to look at texts more holistically.

Hatim and Mason and Hill et al. speak of a text as an act of communication. To communicate, the translator must be aware of meaning on both lower and higher levels of the discourse. Intention, genre, logical relations, cohesion, coherence and intertextuality all play a role in what a text means and how it should be translated.

There is a broad spectrum on what constitutes a good and natural translation. Dooley notes that it may undermine reader confidence in the translation if it is totally rearranged and Carson also cautioned against moving too far from some SL stylistic structures in texts such as poetry. Authors like Culy and Giles encourage rearrangement where the natural structures prefer it. Most authors in this study agreed that a natural

⁸⁷ Vaz, “Functional equivalent translation,” 323-324.

structural equivalent in the RL language that carried the function of the SL feature is preferred.

Of the sources reviewed here, most agree that knowing the discourse structures of the RL is useful, particularly by the RL translators. They did not all agree on how well MTTs need to know the SL features. Nor did they agree on when the discourse features should be introduced into the translation. The bottom-up approaches would focus first on a rough draft of the basic kernel sentences and ideas and then edit it for cohesion and style later. Barnwell and Dooley take this approach. Wendland and Culy strongly emphasize that the style and naturalness should be in focus right away in the first draft. Corrections in accuracy are easier to add to the text later rather than trying to correct poor style or mistranslation because of poor discourse structures.

Only Culy really emphasized tapping into the intuitions of the MTTs as an initial methodology. He developed an oral translation technique meant to draw on this resource and so his training method does not involve a strong focus on the features that a course book like Barnwell emphasizes. For other authors, the type of training, topics discussed, and methodology recommended depends on several variables: Will a native speaker or acquired language speaker be the translator? Will a bottom-up or top-down approach be preferred both in the training aspect and in the translation methodology? Will there be an exegete? How familiar is the trainer with the RL?

Several authors emphasized the need to learn to write well in the RL. This will aid the translators in knowing, appreciating, and using the features of their own language. Interference from the SL will be lessened as translators become more comfortable and knowledgeable concerning the what, how, and when regarding the use of RL features for

the greatest clarity and naturalness. Learning the RL features can be done in workshops, through comparative analysis, by practicing writing in the RL, and by analyzing numerous RL texts.

Grimes and Robinson make an attempt to compare natural and translated texts for features of grammar and style as a method to assessing naturalness. Bartsch does some of this also in her workshop material. Knowing frequencies of features can assist a translator in giving permission to use the necessary ones and cut out those that are forced by the source text. Wendland and Vaz take a different approach as they attempted to match RL structures in a functional way as a text was translated based on analysis of natural texts and then elicited feedback from native speakers. Subjective observations were used to determine the quality as reactions and evaluations of the texts were given by the listeners.

Overall, we come away with the strong recommendation that much more study of text features is needed and that equivalent training of translators is vital to producing well-formed translations in the RL. The literature provided an extensive list of topics, methods, and research that must be covered to fully prepare and develop translators of Biblical texts. The result of such training should result in translation teams with increased capacity and translations that will more accurately reflect the meaning of the source text in a more natural way.

CHAPTER 4

PROJECT DESIGN

Rationale

As previously mentioned by Cahill and Benn¹, translators who are MTTs with minimal training and who have not had the opportunity to study their own language tend to focus on the SL structures. They do not consciously know the structures of their own language and/or do not realize that the RL has a structure, albeit possibly a different structure, which will give an equivalent meaning. Authors Halme-Berneking and Havlášková showed us that interference from the SL is strong when translators do not know their own discourse structures.² Having seen this for myself in Liberia with all three of the projects, a workshop designed to help translators discover and apply RL structures seemed necessary. Given the context and history of Liberia with its view of the local languages, such a workshop would create awareness of the uniqueness of each language. It would also grant permission for translators to use their language structures and would build the capacity of each translator.

The workshop is designed for participants who are already actively translating. These teams working in Liberia have had basic translation training on the job and through a workshop which set forth the principles covered in Barnwell's training manual where most of the content focuses on lower level features. While these are essential for

¹ See quotations by Cahill and Benn on pages 33 and 34.

² See quotations on pages 49 and 51.

translators to know how to handle, discourse structures such as genre, boundary markers, or other features that tie a text together such as referent identification and peak-marking structures must also be addressed in training. “Most translators will benefit significantly by learning to reflect on the structures of their language and how they are used.”³ If this is true, a discourse training workshop should prove beneficial as seen proven by revisions to translated text and/or a general increase in and inclusion of natural discourse forms in translated text.

This particular workshop by Carla Bartsch was brought to my attention by a presentation she gave at the Bible Translation Conference 2015 in Dallas, TX. What attracted me to it was that it was designed with a focus on MTT participants and had a format that could be used by people without a lot of linguistic training. The workshop seemed a good fit because she emphasized self-discovery along with instruction that shows examples. She also designed exercises to apply the new knowledge to translated text. Ideally, participants would discover a feature(s) in the natural text and then rewrite their translated text incorporating such features where appropriate. Another positive aspect of this workshop was that the various translators would meet together as they learned. Given the time, they could share with one another what they had discovered both within the teams and across teams. Two of the languages at the workshop are related and possibly share structures.

³ Watters, “Contrastive Discourse,” 127.

Overview of the Project

This project is set up in the form of a quasi-experiment, before-after design, working with the current translation teams in Liberia, West Africa. The main research for the project occurred during a two-week narrative discourse discovery workshop held July 24-August 4, 2017 in Monrovia, Liberia with the translation teams of the three then current projects. A total of seven translators participated. The workshop was designed by Carla Bartsch and conducted by her with the assistance of Don Slager, UBS consultant, and myself. Its purpose was to aid translators to discover and use the discourse features of their languages in their current translation drafts.

The workshop design gave each team opportunity to analyze various discourse features of their language from texts gathered prior to the workshop and then apply them to select portions of already drafted scripture. For the sake of simplicity and comparison, each team used the same four selections from the Gospel of Mark. These were selected because all the teams had an end-stage base translation approved for printing of the book of Mark. The scripture portions selected were: “Jesus calms the storm” Mark 4:35-41; “Jesus heals a man with evil spirits” Mark 5:1-20; “Jesus blesses little children” Mark 10:13-16; and “The parable of the tenants in the vineyard” Mark 12:1-12.

A comparison of pre- and post-workshop scripture texts as recorded in individual ParaTExt projects was to be the tool to reveal changes to the scripture texts as translators applied new knowledge from their natural texts. The hypothesis was that the revised texts would reflect more of the features common in the natural texts showing the benefits of such a workshop. These changes were to be done on paper as part of various analysis assignments designed into the homework. However, the participants were to make the

changes in ParaTExt projects setup for each individual translator. The program allows one to compare the wording and features of the text before the workshop with the texts as they appeared after the workshop. The changes could be assessed by me in comparison with the pre-workshop texts and in comparison with features discovered in the natural text. The participants were to insert an explanatory note at each change illustrating the reasons for the change and in so doing giving another opportunity to assess what was comprehended from the workshop and what motivated the change in the text. In addition, tables such as those in Appendix D could be used if necessary to count features in the natural texts and those in both the pre- and post-workshop translated texts for comparison. Analysis and assignments took more time than was anticipated. Consequently, the ParaTExt portion of the workshop was not completed until after a post-workshop review. Following the post-workshop review as described below, I collated the revisions from the ParaTExt files to determine the effect the workshop made for both the translators and the translated texts.

Effects of the workshop were also to be elicited using two summary tools asking participants to reflect on their learning and through a final report given by each participant. These latter instruments are designed to be subjective but were looking for the individual's self-assessment on before and after knowledge and abilities. See Chapter 5 for all outcomes, evaluations, and recommendations stemming from the results.

Implementation

Preparation

Prior to the workshop, all participants were asked to gather some natural texts. The criteria for each text was that it should be a true story told initially in the local

language and not translated from English. The texts were to be 15-35 sentences long, contain quotations, describe a problem solved, and told in third person. These texts were to be entered in the computer with a word-for-word backtranslation as well as a free translation. Most of the texts were given to me written on paper. I then transferred each story into the FLEX program for interlinearization⁴ and exported a copy that could be edited in MS Word and formatted into two charts designed by Bartsch. These charts are exactly the same except the heading on the fifth column changes from “Speech/Word order” to “Type of boundary marker, connector” in the second chart to focus the analysis on different discourse features.

The analysis began prior to the workshop as Bartsch and I took at least one story from each language, entered them into the charts she designed, and then analyzed them for various discourse constructions. Other texts were charted as well and analyzed for reference. See Appendix A for the text charts. A system of color-coding helped make various features stand out such as tracking of participants and quotations and their formulas. These charts were also configured and printed without the analysis included so that the teams could practice analyzing and discovering features for themselves during the workshop. Their charts only contained the text and the back translations. The first, fifth, and sixth columns were left blank for them to enter their analysis.

For the sake of time and ease of access, prior to the workshop I placed the scripture texts for each language into similar storyline charts with a bit of color-coding of the quotations for ease of analysis. The fifth and sixth columns were again left blank for

⁴ While every attempt was made to obtain an accurate definition for each morpheme, the interlinearization may not be adequate for a complex language study and the data here should not be used without further verification of the accuracy of the back translation. Some but not all corrections were made during and after the workshop.

purposes of analysis. The storyline was predetermined per Bartsch's analysis of the scripture passage. See Appendix B.

ParaTExt projects were set up for each translator so that as revisions were made, comments could also be made explaining why the change was necessary. Changes could be tracked, and before and after texts could be compared.

Classroom Learning

The workshop was held at the Bible Society building. We had a room set up with a table for each language team. Bartsch used a projector to show examples on the screen at the front of the room. Colored pencils for marking various features were given to each participant. Participants worked from printed charts rather than from the digital files for ease of facilitation.

Topics covered during the workshop included the communication situation, pattern of a story, participant identification, reported speech, literary devices, peak and theme marking, and connectors and other boundary markers. See Appendix C for workshop assignments which give a general overview of what was to be accomplished.

The first topic covered was the communication situation. The translators had been instructed to record when, where, and by whom the story was told and to seek permission to use the story. The purpose for this was to create an awareness of the importance of the context surrounding a story. Some of the stories used names with the assumption that the audience knew who the participants were. This knowledge made us mindful that unknown participants might have a different sort of introduction as we saw in the Mark 5 passage when the man from the graves had to be introduced.

The next topic analyzed was the storyline. Participants were to record in column one where various storyline patterns started. The storyline would become useful later as location of quotations was noted and which boundary markers were used in various places. Peak and theme marking would also be analyzed in relation to the storyline, so it was important to do this early in the analysis process. The storyline is based on content and marks the setting, initiating event, increasing tension, major problems, problem solved, a closing, or a summary statement. These storyline events might happen more than once in episodes throughout the text. One episode might be of major importance and contain the main peak of the story.

Attention was drawn to oral versus written text structures. The style in their written stories might vary from a story told orally. The stories being analyzed were told orally and then written down. The style used in the translation of scripture could more closely follow an oral style or could follow a more formalized, written style. Participants were encouraged to think about their audiences and that in their context most people will be hearing the scriptures read so a more oral style could make the scriptures easier to understand.

The next topic was participant identification. A series of questions was answered to determine main characters, secondary participants, and props. The translators were instructed to color code the participants in their stories using a different color for each referent. Any word that referred to that character was to be colored. This allowed for an easier analysis of how often a referent was mentioned, how they were mentioned—name, noun, pronoun—who had direct speech, etc. Correlations could then be made about how main and secondary participants were introduced, how they were kept track of in the

story, and later how they might participate in quotations. Any special formulas were to be noted such as a participant being introduced before or after a verb, who was named, or who was introduced with the most words. Other correlations were examined such as did it matter how people were mentioned if they were in control of the situation or were victims and when were pronouns or null references used.

Passive and active verb structures were discussed as well as issues of showing respect and how that might affect translation. African cultures require respect of those that are teachers or who are older. This is often shown in nouns of direct address and is a feature that might not be present in SL texts of scripture.

The next big topic was reported speech. Workshop participants were to color code and label all direct speech. Distinctions were made for indirect and semi-direct speech as well. Quote formulas were also color-coded. All quote formulas were labeled by what was included such as speaker, listener, and speech verb. Places where no quote formula occurred were labeled “drama.” Reported speech was analyzed for both type and location in the storyline. Tables 1 and 2 (See Appendix D) compare the natural story reported speech with the Mark 5 passage.

Several analysis assignments focused on the peak of a story. The peak is where the most tension is or where the tension is resolved or both. The storyline around the major problems or problems solved⁵ is where peak is going to be found. Bartsch illustrated various features that might be found at peak and how to identify them. The discourse structure should contain something special to highlight the peak. The same

⁵ Major problems are known as climax in other literature. Problems solved refers to the denouement. The terms were simplified for the benefit of workshop participants who have little to no linguistic background.

features might also be found elsewhere in the story for different reasons such as highlighting theme.

This section of the workshop pointed out a lot of unfamiliar features and some that are difficult to spot. They include parallelism, long-short or short-long descriptions, chiasm or X structure, burger structure (clauses or phrases acting like bookends), tail-head, tail-tail, and head-head constructions as part of repetition which slows down the story. Or, they might mark paragraph boundaries. The head refers to the beginning of a sentence. The tail refers to the end. In tail-head structures the beginning of one sentence repeats something from the end of a sentence that comes before it. In tail-tail structures the end of one sentence is similar to the end of another. For head-head, the beginnings of several sentences are similar. Vivid language and super words were also discussed. Vivid language draws attention and super words express something as a superlative. African languages contain a type of vivid language called ideophones that are not present in SL texts but can make a RL text more interesting. Other things could also mark peak such as fewer connectors or the presence of reported speech. Peak features were listed in the analysis column and were also listed and compared in Table 3. (See Appendix D.)

After these assignments, teams switched over to the second chart and focused on boundaries and connectors. The heading of the fifth column now called attention to theme, boundaries, and connectors. Participants were to look for where in the storyline the theme was brought out and what features similar to peak marking features might be used to indicate it. Titles and section heads were discussed here as they play an important role in the translations.

Boundary markers at the beginning of paragraphs and connectors that occur mid-paragraph were marked and distinguished. They were labeled in the boundaries column as to whether there was no marker, a connecting word, a time word or marker, a location marker, a tail-head construction or other construction that pointed back, a burger structure or a summary statement. Those markers that began a paragraph were distinguished from those mid-paragraph in Tables 4 and 5. (See Appendix D.) The boundary markers were counted and compared with the Mark 5 passage in both those tables.

As the workshop was conducted and various features were discovered, the preselected scripture passages were to be examined. For example, concerning participant identification, the translators were to examine how new characters were introduced in their scripture texts and whether it was done in a similar way to the natural stories. They were to examine if Jesus was being referred to in a similar manner as the main character in their natural texts. To do this, the Mark texts also had to be color-coded for participant identification. Ideally, the same features that were analyzed in the natural stories were to also be analyzed in their current Mark text charts.

While the ParaTExt files were ready to use during the workshop, the application of the assignments to the Mark texts mostly happened after the workshop. Any analysis and application from the workshop remained on paper in their notebooks and charts.

After week one, a workshop summary worksheet was completed. At the close of the workshop, participants gave a summary statement of what they learned. They also completed an evaluation of the course. See Appendix F for compilations of participant responses.

Post-workshop Review

Because participants were not able to fully revise their Scripture passages during the workshop, a final assignment was given asking them to review the features studied and then to complete their revisions in the ParaTExt projects designed for the workshop. (See Appendix E.) The final assignment was not a new assignment but was a written reminder of what we had expected would take place during the workshop. It was written to serve as a reminder as they left the workshop of what we had studied and what was still expected to be done in the ParaTExt files.

Several months following the initial workshop, I met with two of the teams separately to review what was covered and analyzed in the workshop as most of the participants had not completed the final assignment on their own. Prior to meeting with the teams, I reviewed their analyzed charts and synthesized some of the analysis. Time was limited and so not all features were covered thoroughly. We focused on boundary markers and connectors, quote formulas, and peak- marking features. I walked through their natural texts with them and pointed out features that they found in the natural texts and how they compared with the translated texts. They were then given opportunity to work through their final assignment in ParaTExt. These two languages are featured in the appendices and are the focus of the evaluation in the next chapter. The fact that there is little to report on for the third team emphasizes the need for such a follow-up or more time in the workshop itself to apply new knowledge and revise the translation texts.

Evaluation procedure

Following week one of the workshop, the translators completed the week one summary. Following the entire workshop, translators gave a report of what they learned

and completed the workshop evaluation. The week one summary and the workshop evaluation can be found in Appendix F. The report is not included as it was a free form report and the translators simply gave an overview of course content as discussed in Chapter 5.

Following the post-workshop review, I took each ParaTExt project and compared the pre-and post-workshop versions of their scripture texts. I noted all changes and the comments the translators made concerning the changes. I did not find it necessary to make new tables such as those in Appendix D as the changes were obvious and explainable without them. I was also able to observe the translators in action as we worked through a consultant check of various books. I was able to document application of workshop skills to the texts we were checking, and I have made note of this in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 5

OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION

Workshop Implementation

Preparation

The workshop was essentially started a year in advance as collecting the texts and managing logistics needed time as I do not live in Liberia year-round. We did have problems gathering texts that met the criteria. Even though all criteria were explained orally and in writing, several texts had to be rejected because they were not suitable. Very late into the process one text was discovered to be a translation of an English text designed to be translated into various languages for the purposes of another training program. During the workshop itself, another text was discovered to be a summary of the actual story which met the criteria requested particularly regarding quotations. The summary had none. Consequently, some of the discourse discoveries were made by me after the workshop. Some of the texts were very short and it may be beneficial to have slightly longer texts. This would require more time to prepare and analyze but might show a greater variety of features. As with any workshop of this nature, one must keep in mind that a few texts are not going to reveal all there is to know about a language's literary devices and structures.

Another criterion for the stories may need to be that they are told to a native speaker of the language. The original "Collateral" story that was not just a summation seems to contain some explanatory material that might not be in the story had it been told

to someone of the language and culture. I as an outsider making the request for stories may have contributed to the problem. The fact that the participant just gave me a summary at first may also stem from this condition.

Another feature of these stories is that they were all told orally at first before being written down. I don't know if any more than an awareness of that is necessary for this evaluation or for the purposes of the workshop. Differences between oral and written literature were discussed in the workshop. Joan Smith suggests using planned oral literature as a culture moves into defining their written literary style. She suggests that a story be thought about and told up to six times "until a pattern of 'plannedness' is perceived."¹ For that reason, folk tales are often a wealth of good material for analysis. Even a written story is probably going to have oral originations in these societies and oral and written literature often share stylistic features. The caution is a story told extemporaneously might not use the best language forms and from which conclusions should preferably not be drawn.

Classroom Learning

The facilities at the Bible House were more than adequate for the classroom space. We had air-conditioning which helped keep out the distracting street noise and the humidity. However, because the groups were not lodging together, the time for sharing ideas was nearly null. A retreat style setting might have given time for better communication around meals and in the evenings as participants were reviewing and/or doing outside assignments and application. Having everyone together on one campus would also eliminate the long commutes many participants had which also hindered the

¹ Joan Smith, "A Search for Naturalness," 103.

amount of time they could spend looking over their materials and applying them. Some lodged in places where electricity was limited hampering any work on the computer or where light was needed to do assignments.

Ideally, someone knowledgeable linguistically in each language would be present to help direct each team. This is probably the usual case when these workshops are conducted, but not in this situation. Neither consultant to these projects lives in-country or has made a thorough grammar study of any of the languages present at this workshop. The grammar studies available are not in English. Not all particles have a one-to-one correspondence with English and the limited linguistic skills of the translators also limited explanation of definitions or functions of these various particles.² Consequently, some of the back-translations were not as complete or accurate in a helpful way leading to some errors in the charting itself and in the pre-analysis by Bartsch and myself. Some but not all issues were resolved during the workshop and subsequent follow-up time.

A further consequence of the stories being written down for the first time and a low-level of previous written literary experience with their own language stories was the fact that the stories came all in one big paragraph. Participants needed more time to process the storyline and determine where paragraphing made sense for their stories before moving into the boundary and connections portion of the workshop. Some of these factors interact with each other to determine good paragraph boundaries. With most of the information being so new, digesting and synthesizing it all to make a good determination proved difficult. Discoveries were being made concurrently as illustrated with the connector *kpeij* discussed below under Language 1 features where the connector

² Two of the languages have an interesting tense/aspect system that involves the pronouns which we can expect will have some influence at discourse level.

itself helps determine the storyline. Or, as in Language 2, where a time marking phrase often seems to indicate a good place for a paragraph break.

Most translators got behind on their write-ups or did not do so adequately to make full connections or conclusions about their findings. Consequently, the application to the translated Scripture portion was not completed during the workshop as is illustrated in the incomplete or inaccurate tables in Appendix D. Trying to catch up on all features in the final assignment on their own proved difficult. Most did not even attempt to enter changes in ParaTExt or did it in a way that demonstrated they did not understand the assignment. Having a third week to put it all together or to spread out the information flow would have been helpful. Logistics and life circumstances for these teams made this impossible.

Post-workshop Review

I was able to follow-up with two of the teams several months after the workshop. I summarized their analyses along with my own observations before meeting with them. At that time, I reviewed the various topics of the workshop and drew attention to some features that they and I discovered in the natural texts. We discussed the implications for their translations. Each team member was given the opportunity to revisit each scripture text in their ParaTExt project and make revisions. One translator, who previously had only three changes in all four passages, found closer to twenty revisions after our discussion and clarification of both the assignment and natural text features. Not all workshop topics could be reviewed and consequently not all changes were necessarily made. For example, the peak marking features were not reviewed and compared. Neither was the placement of direct speech. Much of the peak in several natural stories was

totally filled with direct speech and no speech occurred elsewhere in the text. What implications this could have for translated scripture texts was not examined. It is possible that these particular stories and texts did not contain the criteria that would influence changes, but that other texts would.

Evaluation procedure

The ParaTExt files for each individual translator were very useful tools. I was able to see immediately any changes to the text and how they were motivated because of the commentary from the translators themselves. They can continue to be used should we choose to expand the review and application process later to cover other workshop topics more thoroughly. Translators were free to make any changes they wanted without fear of harming a real project. They were working within the program they are used to, and the compare tool is easy to use. The actual comparisons are discussed further on in this chapter.

The other feedback given after weeks one and two and the evaluation speak more to the capacity of the translators and their overall satisfaction with the course content and implementation. (See Appendix F.) The questions tended to be general and so also were the answers we were given. The questions seemed to elicit course content rather than course application. Any mention of application was in a very general manner and did not prove or disprove that post-workshop texts would reflect natural texts more than the pre-workshop texts did.

Materials and Workshop Design

Materials for the workshop consisted of several handouts by Bartsch based on her unpublished manual which was available digitally to all at the workshop. She used a

combination of these handouts with screen presentations of data examples and visuals to illustrate the topic under discussion. Participants were also given paper copies of the assignments sheets, fillable tables, and copies of the story charts they were to analyze.

Because the main manual was not given in hardcopy form, most participants did not access it. The handouts did give sufficient information for participants to do their assignments. However, in this situation, a paper copy of the manual may have proven useful. The manual is large enough to make one question the efficacy of printing it out for everyone but not so large that it would be impossible. The educational experience in Liberia would encourage printing of the materials rather than simply supplying a digital copy.

The material Bartsch used to present the various concepts came from both her previous experiences and from some of the additional texts gathered from these participants. This was good as at least for some the material would be familiar as a particular feature was pointed out.

As discussed in Chapter 4, all texts were placed in appropriate columns in charts prior to the workshop. This was a huge time saver and was sensitive to the fact that many of the members of these teams are still new computer users. They do not have the technical skills to manipulate the material into charts. We wanted the workshop to focus on their analysis of texts and not on computer skills. All charts were printed out so that analysis took place on paper.

The simplicity of the charts made them easy to work with. They have only a few columns and were they simply monolingual, would be even easier to follow by the MTTs. However, the charts were sometimes confused because the two different charts

look so much alike. Only one column heading changes. Some translators put all analysis on the same chart. Perhaps printing on different colored paper or having the headings in different colors would have helped. Perhaps only one chart is needed, but then there is the risk of running out of room or getting analysis of one feature jumbled with another. Ideally, a slightly larger piece of paper with an added column would take care of this, but practically speaking many printers won't accommodate this, and they are more difficult to work with on a computer screen. Perhaps the charts simply needed to be described and explained more carefully at the beginning or handed out only when needed which was the intention originally.

The format of assignments where application is interspersed as new concepts are presented is a good idea. Where teams had time to do this, focusing perhaps on just one topic, they were able to make some connections. For example, in the discussion on parallelism, translators from Language 1 immediately saw that they could make Jesus' commands to the wind and waves in Mark 4:35-41 more parallel and did so. They liked the effect.

These participants have never studied linguistics or done analysis of this type. They needed to be walked through the process more methodically and slowly with no prior knowledge or skills assumed. The workshop seemed to assume a higher skill level. Had participants been able to complete their analyses more thoroughly and adequately and then had adequate time to compare and synthesize their findings with their translated texts, I think more creative translation connections and suggestions would have arisen during the workshop itself. The combination of the amount of new material, the new process of how to analyze the texts, and the low level of conscious grammatical

knowledge of each language contributed to a slowing down of understanding. This in turn, made application time very short if not nonexistent. Having the time to work with the teams later was essential to collating the findings and helping the teams make the connections between the features of the natural texts and the translated texts. Without the follow-up time, results from the workshop as evidenced in revisions to the translated texts as discussed below would have been impossible to measure.

The workshop evaluation tools themselves reveal two things. First, most participants expressed extreme satisfaction to have such a learning experience and promised to make use of their new knowledge, and second, the concepts about the topics covered were understood. The evaluation methods we used simply allowed the participants to use their typical Liberian rote style of learning as they recited back to us the general information about all topics covered. No application or new insights into their own languages was demonstrated in these tools for the most part. See Appendix F for summaries of the two evaluations. The reports given by each participant at the end of the workshop are not summarized there as they simply repeated the content of the workshop.

That being said, the amount of new knowledge that the teams acquired is significant. Prior to this workshop, they had only had formal language study in English about English. This was the first time they were given the opportunity to apply literary categories and features to their own language and stories. It is evident from their evaluations that the workshop was highly effective in increasing awareness of linguistic and literary structures and in increasing their capacity to recognize them. In a follow up email with Bartsch concerning the results of this workshop and the possibility of continuing with a non-narrative workshop, she said, “It’s not unusual for the ‘lightbulbs

to go on' the second time people go over discourse material. About the second day of a non-narrative discourse workshop, many of those who have been at a prior narrative workshop start putting things together and understanding it. It makes a good argument for follow-up."³

The final assignment was not well understood until further explained in the post-workshop review. One translator simply answered the questions in a very general way following one of the passages in Mark. It was meaningless because it did not address any specific discourse features or apply them to any specific passages. It was a clear demonstration of the fact that the assignment itself was not understood. Once the assignment was made clear, all the translators applied the discussion as we had it in the post-workshop review to the particular passages in their ParaTExt projects which gave me a post-workshop text to compare with the pre-workshop text.

Linguistic Analysis and Application

Note that this evaluation is on the results of the material and training and not on whether a particular translator learned and applied the features. In other words, we are not evaluating a translator but the resultant work to get an understanding concerning whether such a workshop makes a difference in how translators translate and/or revise text.

The capacity and confidence of the team members increased throughout the workshop. Prior to this workshop, none of the translators had any experience with this type of analyzing. Their abilities to look through the charts and discover features increased as the workshop progressed. In addition, their contribution to the analysis was

³ Carla Bartsch, email to author, July 31, 2018.

enlightening. What we as outsiders determined was the storyline was sometimes altered by their understanding of the culture. For example, in “Complaint from the Farm” the peak is all the investigation that went on. Liberians love a good investigative dialogue. The problem is not resolved by Musu or Jebbeh whom we might determine the story is about, but it is resolved by Varney as he is the main character and the one leading the investigation. He is the elder and the one to whom the complaint is given. These connections are all culturally driven.

Summary of Applied Features to Translated Text

Actual findings for each language will only be discussed where relevant for indicating how translators used them in the revised scripture texts. A complete or partial discourse description is not the purpose of this project. The focus is on those features that became evident through the study of these texts and how they could be and were incorporated into a revision of the select scripture passages. It is highly possible there are other features that could be understood from further study of these and other texts. Only two of the three languages will be discussed here as no follow-up has been done with the third team.

The workshop was designed around scripture texts already charted and thus made it most tenable to offer revisions rather than a new translation. The reading and analysis of the current translation would perhaps skew a fresh translation anyway. In addition, there was the time factor involved in drafting brand-new text. One of the teams is in the process of revising an already published translation so this provided good practice. The way the current projects are run, editing is a necessary skill. However, this does not discount that perhaps for future workshops, each translator should start fresh with their

own rendition and then start fresh again at the end of the workshop. Of course, two drafts are only necessary if evaluation of the effects of the workshop is one of the goals. Otherwise, only a post-workshop draft is necessary with some feature comparison between natural and translated text to evaluate the use of natural forms. Editing a previous draft or drafting anew with new discourse knowledge still builds capacity in the translator as both skills are useful.

This summary simply enumerates a limited set of features that indicate that the various translators are now aware of these types of constructions that can be used and were seen as being appropriate for this revision. It is only an indication of features that they noted in these passages. Given other passages, it is possible other features would be recognized and used.

Language 1

In all four passages, the section heads reflect the main idea or theme of the story in much the same way that the titles did for the natural stories. No change was made to the section heads.

One discovery that is evident throughout the revisions in Language 1 is that the natural stories use very few connectors especially at peak and the translation passages tended to have many because of an adherence to the SL text structures. It is evident from their tables on boundary markers that during the workshop, counting connectors proved confusing. As already mentioned, these stories were not paragraphed well when written, so determining the count of connectors at boundaries and those which were not was difficult. In addition, as the storyline for the story “The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah” was further understood, one marker *kpeij* seems to highlight a problem solved on the

storyline. Knowing this, helped us define the storyline better in that story and in “Complaint from the Farm.”⁴ This word is back translated as “then” but it is more of a logical relator than a time marker. Consequently, it was overused in the translation texts and used at inappropriate places because it carries a different function than “then” in English. The only place the connector *yèè* “and” is found in the natural stories is at the closing for “Complaint from the farm.” However, the translated texts tended to use it a lot at the beginning of sentences throughout a story.

When these discovered features were reviewed during a subsequent checking session on the book of Luke, the editing translator worked ahead on the material to revise it according to the new knowledge. This was particularly evident with the overuse of “and.” The translator removed most them which were numerous especially those occurring at the beginning of a sentence.

In other places we paid attention to the use of *kpeij*. In Luke 15:14-15, *kpeij* was used as “then” twice in their original draft. “Then a famine came” and “then he went to work on a farm.” Neither one of these places was a correct use of the word. The revision arranged the clauses in a different logical arrangement eliminating the use of the word here. The revision made better use of time marker phrases as found in the natural texts and used other connecting phrases to more clearly relay the meaning of the text both in terms of naturalness and accuracy. Increased confidence levels were evidenced by a willingness to go ahead and make the changes prior to further group checking in addition to a move away from a strict adherence to the source text connecting structures. When I

⁴ For example, we initially marked the problem solved where Musu admits to forgetting her rice. However, the problem is really solved as the investigation is brought to a close by the main character Varney as he declares the outcome. This sentence is highlighted with *kpeij*.

would prompt at various places that *kpeij* might be a good fit according to the theory that it marks problem solved, the team often agreed, and the change was made.

Within the selected scripture texts from the workshop, translator 1A removed *yèè* “and” from Mark 4:36 and 41. The latter instance was replaced with a better connector which shows coordination between two referents. Another connector was removed from 4:41 as well. More connectors, mostly *yèè*, were removed from Mark 5:1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, and 24. Some were unnecessary, and some needed a different conjunction that coordinates referents, something English does not have. Clearly, the pre-workshop translated text was following the SL text too closely. More connector changes were made at Mark 10:16, 12:1, and 12:4. Most of these changes had to do with too much use of the connector *yèè*, but several in 12:1 dealt with the incorrect use of *kpeij*.

All translators made changes at Mark 4:35, 36, and 38 to correct the term for disciple. This does not seem to be something that came directly from the workshop, but the team realizes now they want to use a different term here and they made the change for consistency. The other passages were corrected for this term throughout.

In Mark 4:39, Jesus’ words were changed to reflect a more parallel construction regarding his command to the wind and the waves. The team was excited about this change and liked the result.

At Mark 5:2, the team agreed that the unknown referent of the man with the evil spirits was introduced correctly using “one” or “certain” as a modifier. Their natural stories did not contain unknown referents, but their discussion confirmed it had been translated correctly when this topic was discussed during the workshop. In Mark 5:6, 8

and 12:6, translator 1A reintroduced the nouns for several referents to make the text clearer.

Translator 1B replaced some nouns with pronouns only in reference to the boat in Mark 4:36-37 following the pattern in natural stories where pronouns are sufficient if the identity of the referent is already clear.

In Mark 4:38 and 41, translator 1B removed an unnecessary conjunction and replaced one with the proper coordinating conjunction as discussed earlier. He also made changes to connectors at 5:4, 5, 12 and 19. He continued to remove excess connectors in chapter 5 although that was not part of the assignment.

Translator 1C made some word order changes in 4:35 and 38 to make them less like English word order. The referents in 4:36 were all changed to pronouns for easier flow. In 4:39, the pronoun is used for Jesus as he had already been mentioned, and it was clear. This is done in Mark 5:2 as well. Once Jesus is named, this translator prefers to remove the NCP in front of the name as it is not always necessary to keep repeating it when a name is used as is seen in a few places in the natural story texts. This is a topic for follow-up as it is not applied consistently nor is it the case in most instances of referent identification in the natural story texts.

Translator 1C is also aware of the connector problem and removed some at 4:36, 5:5 and 5:19 where in the latter he replaced “and” with a logical relator. In 12:5 he replaced *yèè* with *kpeij*.

Language 2

In all four passages, the section heads reflect the main idea or theme of the story in much the same way that the titles did for the natural stories. No changes were made to the section heads.

In Language 2, translator A made the following revisions to the Scripture texts in the special ParaTExt project which reflect new knowledge from the workshop. Noun reference for a participant referent in Mark 4:36 was changed to a pronoun where it was redundant. The name was used too many times. This is consistent with translator 2A's homework Analysis 12 where it was observed that the use of pronouns can reduce the number of times a name is needed. This is also where a new referent introduction was evaluated. Both translators agree that the man with the evil spirits was introduced correctly in Mark 5 using the formula "one man." Translator 2B did suggest that the information about him having an evil spirit could be incorporated into the introduction rather than listed as a separate clause.

An "and" was added to connect two sentences in Mark 4:36 where three clauses were strung together but where a change of location occurred at that particular clause. Whether this was a naturalness correction or a matter of personal preference requires further investigation. In 4:39 and 5:4, translator 2A removed a period and replaced it with a comma in front of another form of "and." This is consistent with the natural texts where this form of "and" never occurred sentence initial. In both places the "and" was coordinating two like actions.

A borrowed term for “teacher” was replaced with a local term in Mark 4:38 showing confidence on the part of this translator to use the local term. Another word was changed in Mark 12:6 from a nearby language term to the local language term.

A vivid word meaning “catch” or “hold” was added to Mark 5:3 so that collocation was natural. One must be caught before tied demonstrating an awareness of local language meaning and a need for clarification where the source language verbiage did not require the same.

A common generic tail-head connector was added in two places where the focus changed slightly but some tie-in was needed. This happened at Mark 5:11 to show the connection with the demons’ request and that the pigs were nearby and in Mark 12:5 as tension is increasing. In Mark 12:4 a specific tail-head “When they sent the first worker back” was added as the conflict is developing. The unabridged “Collateral” story used many tail-head connectors to keep the story moving especially to indicate a location change and during the developing of conflict. This was something we discussed during our follow-up time and these edits reflect that discussion.

At the time of our discussion, the team and I were working through the book of Esther. We noted several places in Esther where a tail-head connector would serve the text well. One such example was Esther 6:12. The scene changes quite a bit and the generic connector was not as effective as saying “When they finished going around.” We noted that most of these types of connectors in the natural stories were specific to the story and the use of a generic “When that happened” was not common.

Translator 2A also changed the location of a logical relator from being at the beginning of a sentence to the middle reflecting a more natural placement in Mark 10:14.

Translator 2B also modified some connectors. He started at the beginning of Mark 4. An unnecessary connector was removed at 4:7. A generic tail-head connector was replaced with a specific one having to do with the story at 4:9 “After Jesus finished telling the parable.” This was done again in 5:17. A tail-head connector was added several times for a slight change in focus in the story and to move the story forward in time such as at 4:39.

A noun of direct address was added where respect needed to be shown and the verse reworded at Mark 4:38. Where some vivid language had been used in 4:39 and 5:7, exclamation marks were added to highlight the vivid language. This translator particularly mentioned this as part of his new understanding from the workshop.

Several particles not present in the source text were inserted into the translation for naturalness. One such particle *ka* does not have an English equivalent but somehow makes a sentence complete. I have seen it removed when we combine sentences together. More study on its use is needed, but for now, this translator recognized it was better to have it even though it is clearly not part of the source text.

Participants were clarified with nouns where pronoun identification was confusing. The translator recognized that many pronouns were used throughout the text and that this was okay.

In Mark 10:14 several changes are recorded. One has to do with the quote formula where the morpheme *kélè* is added. This special morpheme for which the exact function is under study is back translated as “that,” but the quotations following it are direct making it fall under the category of semi-direct quotation. It is not included in every quote formula before a direct quotation. The unabridged “Collateral” story uses it several

times and once as the only word in the quote formula which normally contains a speaker, another speech word and possibly the listener. At that point it is used prior to a speech act. The translator indicates that he made the changes to this scripture verse to “add the quote formula (he added *kélè*) and put Jesus’ statement in this verse in one quote.” There was a quote formula originally, but it lacked the *kélè* and the quotation was originally all together and not split. However, a logical relator was removed from the beginning of a sentence and the sentence restructured so it is in the middle which is maybe where the translator perceived he was keeping the quotation together in a better way.

Evaluation of Course Effectiveness with Recommendations

Overall, such a workshop is useful to producing more natural texts as evidenced above through the numerous changes made in the select scriptures and those made during other consultant checking. The benefit to the translators’ skills and confidence cannot be overstated as already described above under the section Materials and Workshop Design where the knowledge base of literary application to the receptor language was hugely expanded. As teams gain capacity, my prediction is that they will continue to be more aware that they do not need to be such slaves to source text structures but will be freed up to use the structures that sound “sweet” to their ears. My hope is that they will continue to expand their repertoire of natural text features as they continue to pay attention to them since they have now been made aware that such features exist and that it is acceptable for their translations to look different from source text structure.

More analyses of countable features such as referent identification and connectors are needed. Looking at other sections in Mark revealed repetition of a generic tail-head connector unlike the stories which had a true tail-head specifically formulated to reflect

the previous action. While this change is not evidenced in the selections used in the assignment, the L2 team immediately saw problems with the repetition of the generic connector and agreed this was a revision they should make.

Peak marking features and the use of reported speech are two areas that were not treated thoroughly. Both are strongly influenced by the SL text and studying their use in the natural texts may influence some changes in translated text as they revealed a preference for use of reported speech during peak.

Additional recommendations

While the workshop contributed greatly to a beginning database of discourse knowledge, having a basic grammar description for each language would be helpful along with the vocabulary to discuss it. A grammar explaining lower level patterns could contribute to discourse knowledge where lower level patterns might change or vary. Knowledge of the pronoun system and class system for each language would have facilitated charting and analysis particularly for referent identification but also for keeping track of the storyline. A general working knowledge of language-specific sentence structure on the part of all participants would have aided them in their analysis and provided more capacity building as they could readily discuss such features and the options available to them. A simple dictionary of each language would also be useful.

More discovery workshops on other genres would be important. The features discovered here may or may not transfer to another genre type. The analysis skills capacity of the teams should increase as other genres are examined. The same general methods should prove beneficial.

The nature of the translation program is people working in teams. If possible, having the teams stay together on one campus could contribute to more economical use of time providing more time to analyze, to ask questions, to compare notes, and to dig deeper. Staying together would have facilitated more sharing among the groups to recognize and elevate the specialness of their particular language features as well as validate their use, perhaps prompting one team to look for similar features they missed in their own analysis.

As it was, the translators stayed throughout the area with family members. Some had to get up several hours ahead of time to catch a taxi and then faced a several- hour commute again at the end of the day. Other distractions occurred because family members were far away, computer skills were fairly low, and no one had prior analytical skills of this nature.

Another way to measure the effectiveness of the workshop would be to take the before and after texts out into the community for evaluation. These would be subjective evaluations along the line of what Wendland described in his article “What’s the Difference?”, but the indication of people’s preferences could also reveal whether, and perhaps how, the revised text was better or worse than the original version. This is strongly recommended where time and circumstance allow and where there is a translation tester who has been well trained in proper methodology.

Training in more knowledge of the natural text structures should always be a goal. We do it in our own education system. Being able to consciously use language tools to elicit the right understanding or response can help counteract the tendency in translation to follow a source text too closely. The norm in translation team training for Bible

translation is to focus on the structures of the source text. Equal time and effort should go into studying the receptor language structures alongside the other. This study should be done sooner in the training process and not after a large corpus of translation drafts are accumulated.

I will close with some thoughts from Douglas Robinson's book *Becoming a Translator*. He encourages translators to mimic and practice. The better something is known, the more it can be played with. "What we do not do is sit down with a comprehensive set of rules for linguistic equivalence and create a text that conforms to them. This is the image projected by traditional linguists when they have studied translation; the image does not correspond to reality."⁵ This may seem like what we are trying to do with such a workshop. However, he goes on to say how such training is needed to help translators analyze all the various aspects of a text but with the goal of making these skills second nature.⁶ "Good translators are lifelong learners... Translation is intelligent activity requiring constant growth, learning, self-expansion."⁷ Both good and mediocre translators are careful, conscientious and analytical. Both rely on subliminal processing. As quoted at the beginning of this project but bears repeating: "The difference is that the good translator has trained his or her intuitions more thoroughly than the mediocre one, and in relying on those intuitions is actually relying on years of internalized experience and intelligent reflection."⁸ We do MTTs a disservice if they are not trained in RL structures. Or put positively, we bolster the translation process

⁵ Douglas Robinson. *Becoming a Translator* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003) 148.

⁶ Robinson, *Becoming a Translator*, 209.

⁷ Robinson. *Becoming a Translator*, 221.

⁸ Robinson. *Becoming a Translator*, 211.

and the MTT skills and their confidence by training in methods to analyze the structures of the RL while learning to incorporate this knowledge into the translation process.

APPENDIX A
CHARTS OF NATURAL STORIES

Language 1

The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart A

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 analysis pre-workshop The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah	Speech, Word order	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. <i>Jaa, soldiers</i>		
TITLE	1		Ke dɔ̄ɛ aŋ kaadòduà nyan naŋ wa kùwo wo Jaa lε. NCP4 day NCP3-PL soldier PST used to caught NCP1 Jah is		
The day the <i>soldiers</i> caught <i>Jah</i> .					
Setting	2ab	E nan teengà ke dɔ̄ò guùŋ bà NCP6 PST time NCP4 day one some	yee wo Jaa naŋ kò kaàmè e nenjè ko jawai e dùa dìi. and NCP1 Jah PST go looking NCP6 food NCP8 town NCP6 war under	Time-SVPlaceTime	
It happened one day, then <i>Jah</i> went looking for food in the town during the war (because they were hiding in the bush.)					
Initial Event	3ab	E teenga wo Jaa naŋ hài ko jàwài lè,	wo naŋ mεŋ aŋ kaadòduà nyan ko jawài. he PST met NCP3-PL soldiers all of them NCP8 town	TimeSVOPlace	Tail-head 2b/3a

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 analysis pre-workshop The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah	Speech, Word order	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Jaa, soldiers		
		NCP6 time NCP1 Jah PST reach NCP8 town the			
		At the time Jah reached to town, he met the soldiers all of them in the town.			
	4ab	Kpeɪŋ Then	wò Jaa naŋ nyinj dùnj sìwè yèè wò naŋ nyenɛŋ ko jawa kòi. NCP1 Jah PST them ran hand. and he PST hid NCP8 town near	TimeSOV, SVPlace	Vivid language 4 ran from their hands (escaped)
		Then Jah ran from their hands (escaped) and he hid near the town.			
Major Problems	5ab	Nàànj wò Jaa yàa naŋ goongo kè aŋkaadòdùà nyaj kèè, when NCP1 Jah *** PST thinking that NCP3-PL soldiers all of them went back	wo . folà gbuusàì yèè aŋ naunj kuwo. he came out openly and they him catch	SO(pron)V	PEAK 5-11 Super word 5 soldiers all of them
		When Jah was thinking that the soldiers all of them had left, he came out of hiding (openly) and they caught him .			
	6ab		Àŋ nàunj tɔtù dàwè nyààn, "Ko nènèŋ muŋ kùwa lè? they him start ask they-say "Where money you have Sèè muŋ go niŋ hianj e dòum nàŋ jiwè."	SOVV Speaker, listener, 2 speech verbs before direct quote	Direct quote with 2 speech verbs 'ask say' Vivid Ig: 6 'we will kill you', 7 'I don't have any money..', hee! 8 we will beat you X
	6c				

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 analysis pre-workshop The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah	Speech, Word order	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Jaa, soldiers		
			if you do not it bring we will-you *** kill		structure: A 6 'Where money B you have C If you do not bring it, we will kill you.' B' ..I do not have A' any money in hand
			They began asking him saying, "Where is the money you have? If you do not bring it, we will kill you."		
7ab	7c		Wò nan nyin wò wààn, "Min kùwa e nènèŋ gbiŋ siwè. he PST them said he-said I do not have NCP6 money all hand Weetii, kɔnɛɛŋ lè daàngenim miŋ ka, heel!" for that please leave me go ***	SOVV Speaker, listener, 2 speech verbs before direct quote	Direct quote with 2 speech verbs 'said said' Super word 7 I don't have any money 8 all of them 9 all ('never had anything') Exclamation 7c hee! PR: 'please' shows respect
			He said to them, he said , "I don't have any money in hand. For that (So) Please leave me go, hey!"		
8abc			Àŋ kaadòduà nyaj nyààn, "Sèè muŋ go wiì fè e nènèŋ e manaj lè, e doum nan bulò. NCP3-PL soldiers all of them they-say if you do not us give NCP6 we want is we will-you PST beat	SSV Speaker, speech verb before quote.	Parallelism 8c/10 e doum naŋ bulò/ŋ nauŋ tɔɔtù bùla. We will-you PST beat/they him start beat
			The soldiers all of them they said, "If you don't give us the thing we want, we will beat you."		
9	Kɛɛ But		wò Jaa kuwa wa e nènèŋ	SVO	PR wò Jaa 'he Jaa'

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 analysis pre-workshop The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah	Speech, Word order	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Jaa, soldiers		
			Jah had used to NCP6 thing all		
			But Jah never had anything.		
	10	Kpeinj Then	aŋ naun tɔɔtù bùla. they him start beat	TimeSO(pron)V	
			Then they began to beat him.		
Problems Solved	11abc		Aŋ naŋ bùlo wo Jaa kpoloò yèè aŋ naun dààngè yèè aŋ kaadòduà nyan àn kèè ko bèi aŋ yewè lè. they PST beat NCP1 Jah a while and they him left and NCP3-PL soldier all of them they went back NCP8 place they came	SVOTime, SO(pron)V, SSSV-Place	Long sentence A chain of clauses connected with yèè Super word soldiers <u>all</u> of them Word order change ‘They <u>beat</u> Jah <u>for certain time</u> ...’
They beat Jah for certain time, and they left him and soldiers they went back to the place they came from.					

1. Who is quoted directly? Jah and soldiers
2. Who gives a command? Closest to it are the soldiers.
3. Who thinks about a situation and decides what needs to be done? The soldiers, Jah decides to hide and decides when it is “safe” to come out.
4. Who judges others in the story? [Who decides that someone is good or bad or decides that someone is doing the right thing or doing the wrong thing?] The soldiers decided that Jah was “lying” and should be beaten.
5. Who solves the problem? soldiers
6. Who do the people in the story respond to? [Who is the one in the story that others want to please or other people do what that person says they should?] Jah responds to the soldiers by hiding, and then by coming out when he thinks they are gone.

7. **With whom does the narrator empathize** (identify with, understand, sympathize with, have compassion)?
 [Is there anywhere in the story where the author tells how a participant feels? Does the author cause you to like one of the participants more than the others?] **Jah**

The one who was named most often in answer to the above questions is the 'main character. Others who are named are Secondary Participant 1, Secondary Participant 2... Minor participants are usually not mentioned in answering these questions.

Main characters: **Soldiers (6), Secondary participant 1: Jah (3)**

Prop: food, town, bush

How are participants introduced? Jah is introduced by naming him using NCP (as though people already know him). Soldiers are brought in with a NP in the PL with the NCP.

- Is 'one' or 'a certain...' used to introduce the main character? No
- Is the main character introduced before he does anything in the story? No
- Is the main character introduced with more words than the other participants? No
- Are the main character and the major participants introduced before the verb or after the verb? Jah is before the verb as subject. Soldiers are brought in as objects.

How are participants referred to?

Jah: Name 2b, 3a, 4, 5a, 9, 11a (obj) (all with NCP), Pronoun: 3b, 4b, 5a, 5b (obj) 6a (obj), 7a, 10 (obj), 11b, (obj)

Soldiers: NP with NCP: 3b (obj), 4a (their hands obj), 5a, 8a, 11c Pronoun: 5b, 6a, 7a (obj), 10, 11a, 11b, 11c (relative)

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Name, Noun, Noun</u> <u>Phrase</u>	<u>Name, Noun, Noun</u> <u>Phrase + NCP when introduced</u>	<u>NCP + Name, Noun,</u> <u>Noun Phrase + AFTER being introduced</u>	<u>Pronoun</u>
Jah	--	1	5 'NCP1 Jah'	8
Soldiers	--	1	4 'NCP3-PL soldier'	7

Observations: Introducing participants: Both are introduced with a standard noun phrase. The soldiers have one less reference in each category. They speak most.

How are participants followed through a story? 1)

Jah is introduced with 'wo' plus his name. Pronouns are used after that except in the connecting clauses where Jah is repeated or after a clause where the soldiers are mentioned. Both of these clauses also have a connector (4a and 9, then and but respectively). His name is used in the resolution/closing.

The soldiers are introduced with a NP. The NP is repeated in 5a connecting clause. 8a also has a NP. This is the 2nd time the soldiers speak, it is after Jah's reply. NP again at the very end

Table 1: Comparison of information in quote formulas in natural L1 story with a Bible story (These tables are part of the chart analysis)

<u>Quote Formulas</u>	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word 8	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word
	Speaker + <i>listener</i> + speech word Speaker + <i>listener</i> + 2 speech words 6,7	Speaker + <i>listener</i> + speech word

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: There are only three quotations, so more data is needed. In two of the quotations, two speech words are used, drawing attention to those quotations. Vivid language and super words are also used to draw attention to these two quotations.

The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart B

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 analysis pre-workshop The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah	Type of Boundary, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Jaa, soldiers		
TITLE	1		Ke dɔ̄è aŋ kaadòduà nyaŋ naŋ wa kùwo wo Jaa lɛ. NCP4 day NCP3-PL soldier PST used to caught NCP1 Jah is		
The day the soldiers caught Jah .					

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 analysis pre-workshop The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah							Type of Boundary, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Jaa, soldiers								
Setting	2ab	E NCP6 NCP4 one	nanj teengà ke dòò guùŋgà PST time day some	yee and	wo e NCP1 looking NCP6 NCP6	Jaa nenjè dùa Jah PST food war	nanj ko dii. PST go NCP8 under	kò jawai	kaàmè e	Time marker	B-Beginning of story shows time when story happened. THEME (2,6,11): During the war, the soldiers caught Jah in town, thinking he had money. When he said he didn't have money they beat him and then they left him.
		It happened one day, then Jah went looking for food in the town during the war (because they were hiding in the bush.)									
Initial Event	3ab	E NCP6	teenga wo Jaa nanj hài ko jàwàì lè, time NCP1 Jah PST reach NCP8 town the	wo he met them	naŋ nyanj ko NCP8	mεεŋ ko jawài. NCP3-PL	aŋ kaadòduà soldiers all of town		Tail-head		
		At the time Jah reached to town, he met the soldiers in the town.									
	4ab	Kpeɪŋ Then	wò yè jawa NCP1 and town	Jaa wò kòi. Jah PST them hid near	naŋ naŋ nyenεŋ ko	dùòŋ nyenεŋ ran hand. NCP8	sìwè		Time word	Vivid language 4 ran from their hands (escaped)	
		Then Jah ran from their hands (escaped) and he hid near the town.									
Major Problems	5ab	Nààŋ wò Jaa yàa naŋ goongo kè ankaadòduà nyanj kè,	wo he	. fola naunj kuwo.	gbuusàì openly him catch	yè and	aŋ they		Time marker	PEAK 5-11 B-Change of participants, time. Super word 5 soldiers <u>all</u> of them	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 analysis pre-workshop The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah	Type of Boundary, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Jaa, soldiers		
		when NCP1 Jah *** PST thinking that NCP3-PL soldiers all of them went back			
When Jah was thinking that the soldiers had left, he came out of hiding (openly) and they caught him.					
6ab	6c		<p>Aŋ nàun tɔɔtù dàwè nyààn, "Ko nènèŋ mun kùwa lè? they him start ask they-say "Where money you have Sèè mun go niŋ hiaŋ e doùm nàŋ jiwè." if you do not it bring we will-you *** kill</p>	No marker	<p>Direct quote with 2 speech verbs 'ask say' Vivid Ig: 6 'we will kill you', 7 'I don't have any money..', hee! 8 we will beat you X structure: A 6 'Where money B you have C If you do not bring it, we will kill you.' B' ..I do not have A' any money in hand</p>
7ab	7c		<p>Wò naŋ nyin wòò wààn, "Miŋ kùwa e nènèŋ gbiŋ siwè. he PST them said he-said I do not have NCP6 money all hand Weetii, kɔɔneɛŋ lè daàngénim miŋ ka, hee!" for that please leave me go ***</p>	No marker	<p>B-Change of speaker Direct quote with 2 speech verbs 'said said' Super word 7 I don't have any money 8 all of them 9 all ('never had anything') Exclamation 7c hee! PR: 'please' shows respect</p>
			He said to them, he said , "I don't have any money in hand. For that (So) Please leave me go, hey!"		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 analysis pre-workshop The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah	Type of Boundary, Connector	Analysis	
			Quote formula, direct quote. Jaa, soldiers			
	8abc		Àŋ kaadòduà nyan nyààn , “Sèè munj go wii fè e nèèñ e manaq lε, e doum nañ bulò. NCP3-PL soldiers all of them they-say if you do not us give NCP6 we want is we will-you PST beat	No marker	B-Change of speaker Parallelism 8c/10 e doum nañ bulò/añ naunq tɔotù bùla. We will-you PST beat/they him start beat	
The soldiers said, “If you don’t give us the thing we want, we will beat you.”						
	9	Kèè but	wò Jaa kuwa wa e nèèñ gbiñ. Jah had used to NCP6 thing all	Connecting word Kèè ‘But’	PR wò Jaa ‘he Jaa’	
		But Jah never had anything.				
	10	Kpein Then	añ naun tɔotù bùla. they him start beat	Time word Kpein ‘Then’		
		Then they began to beat him .				
Problems Solved	11abc		Àŋ nañ bulò wo Jaa kpoloò yèè añ naun dààngè yèè añ kaadòduà nyan añ kèè ko bëi añ yewè lε. while PST beat NCP1 Jah a and they him left and NCP3-PL soldier all of them they went back NCP8 place they came	No marker	Long sentence A chain of clauses connected with yèè Super word soldiers <u>all of them</u> Word order change ‘They beat Jah <u>for certain time...</u>	
They beat Jah for certain time, and they left him and soldiers went back to the place they came from.						

Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers in a Natural Story and a Bible story

	L1 "Complaint from the Farm" Story	L1 "The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah" Story	Mark 5:1-20
No marker	4,8,10,13,14 = 5	7,8	
Connecting word	'And/then' 17 = 1		
Time word	'Kpeinj' 'Then' 15 = 1		
Time marker	'One day' 2	'It happened one day' 2,5	
Location marker			
Tail-head connection			
Marker that points back			
Burger structure			
Ending boundary – Summary statement			

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: Most of the paragraphs in the natural “Complaint” story begin with no marker, while half of the paragraphs in the “Jah” story begin with no marker. In the “Complaint” story one time word ‘Kpeinj’ ‘Then’ is used at the beginning of a paragraph, and the word Yèè, ‘And/then,’ which could be a connecting word or time word is used at the beginning of the Closing. Both stories tell when the story happened, “One day,” at the beginning of the story. A time marker is used in one other place in the “Jah” story. More stories need to be studied in order to know if there are other markers that can be used with natural L1 stories, and whether they prefer to have no marker at the beginning of most paragraphs.

Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within Paragraphs in a Natural Story and a Bible story

	L1 "Complaint from the Farm" Story	L1 "The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah" Story	"Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits" Mark 5:1-20
No Marker	3,9 = 2	6,7,8,11 = 4	
Connecting word		Kèè 'But' 9 = 1	
Time word		Kpeinj 'Then' 10 = 1	
Time marker	5,6,7(?)= 3	3,4 = 2	
Tail-head connection			
Ending boundary – Summary statement			

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: No marker or a time marker are the most-used ways to begin a sentence within an L1 paragraph. The “Jah” story also uses one connecting word and one time marker. More stories need to be studied in order to know if there are other markers that can be used with natural L1 stories, and whether they prefer to have no marker or a time marker at the beginning of sentences within most paragraphs.

The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart for Analysis¹

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 for analysis by team The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
TITLE	1		Ke dɔ̄ɛ aŋ kaadòduà nyan nan wa kùwo wo Jaa le. NCP4 day NCP3-PL soldier PST used to caught NCP1 Jah is		
			The day the soldiers caught Jah.		
	2ab	E naŋ teengà ke dɔ̄ò guùŋ bà NCP6 PST time NCP4 day one some	yee wo Jaa naŋ kò kaàmè e nenjè ko jawai e dùa dìi. and NCP1 Jah PST go looking NCP6 food NCP8 town NCP6 war under		
			It happened one day, then Jah went looking for food in the town during the war (because they were hiding in the bush.)		
	3ab	E teenga wo Jaa naŋ hài ko jàwài lè, NCP6 time NCP1 Jah PST reach NCP8 town the	wo naŋ mɛŋ aŋ kaadòduà nyan ko jawài. he PST met NCP3-PL soldiers all of them NCP8 town		
			At the time Jah reached to town, he met the soldiers in the town.		
	4ab	Kpein Then	wò Jaa naŋ nyin dùŋ sìwè yè wò naŋ nyenŋ ko jawa kòi. NCP1 Jah PST them ran hand. and he PST hid NCP8 town near		

¹ For the sake of space, only one of the charts with blank analysis columns is reproduced here and in the following sections. Teams were given two charts where column 5 was labeled for analysis of the speech quotations and word order or for the boundary markers and connectors.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 for analysis by team The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah	Analysis of quotes	Analysis		
			Then Jah ran from their hands (escaped) and he hid near the town.				
	5ab	Nààn <small>j</small> wò Jaa yàà naŋ goongo kè aŋ kaadòdùà nyaŋ kèè, when NCP1 Jah *** PST thinking that NCP3-PL soldiers all of them went back	wo fola gbuusàì yè aŋ nauŋ kuwo. he came out openly and they him catch				
		When Jah was thinking that the soldiers had left, he came out of hiding (openly) and they caught him.					
	6ab		Àŋ nàun <small>j</small> tɔɔtù dàwè nyààn <small>j</small> , "Ko nεnèŋ muŋ kùwa lè? they him start ask they-say "Where money you have				
	6c		Sèè muŋ go niŋ hiaŋ e doùm nàŋ jiwè." if you do not it bring we will-you *** kill				
		They began asking him saying, "Where is the money you have? If you do not bring it, we will kill you.					
	7ab		Wò naŋ nyiŋ wòò wààn <small>j</small> , " Miŋ kùwa e nεnèŋ gbiŋ siwè. he PST them said he-said do not have NCP6 money all hand I				
	7c		Weetii, kɔɔnεn <small>j</small> lè daàngenim miŋ ka, hee!" for that please leave me go ***				

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 for analysis by team The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah	Analysis of quotes	Analysis		
			He said to them he said , "I don't have any money in hand.				
	8abc		<p>Àŋ kaadòduà nyàŋ nyààŋ, " Sèè muŋ go wiì fè e nèèŋ e manaŋ lè, e doum naŋ bulò.</p> <p>NCP3-PL soldiers all of them they-say if you do not us give NCP6 we want is we will-you PST beat</p>				
			The soldiers said, " If you don' t give us the thing we want, we will beat you."				
	9	Kèè but	wò Jaa kuwa wa e nèèŋ gbiŋ. Jah had used to NCP6 thing all				
			But Jah never had anything.				
	10	Kpein Then	aŋ naŋ tɔɔtù bùla. they him start beat				
			Then they began to beat him.				
	11abc		<p>Àŋ naŋ bùlo wo Jaa kpoloò yèè aŋ nauŋ dààngè yèè aŋ kaadòduà nyàŋ àŋ kèè ko bɛi aŋ yewè lè. they PST beat NCP1 Jah a while and they him left and NCP3-PL soldier all of them they went back NCP8 place NCP3-PL came</p>				
			They beat Jah for certain time, and they left him and soldiers went back to the place they came from.				

- 1. Who is in the story from beginning to end?**
- 2. Who is quoted directly?**
- 3. Who gives a command?**
- 4. Who thinks about a situation and decides what needs to be done?**
- 5. Who judges others in the story? [Who decides that someone is good or bad or decides that someone is doing the right thing or doing the wrong thing?]**
- 6. Who solves the problem?**
- 7. Who do the people in the story respond to? [Who is the one in the story that others want to please or other people do what that person says they should?]**
- 8. With whom does the narrator empathize** (identify with, understand, sympathize with, have compassion)?
[Is there anywhere in the story where the author tells how a participant feels? Does the author cause you to like one of the participants more than the others?]

The one who was named most often in answer to the above questions is the 'main character. Others who are named are Secondary Participant 1, Secondary Participant 2... Minor participants are usually not mentioned in answering these questions.

The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart A version 1 by Translator1A

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
TITLE	1		Ke dòè aŋ kaadòduà nyan nan wa kúwo wo Jaa le. NCP4 day NCP3-PL soldier PST used to caught NCP1 Jah is		
			The day the soldiers caught Jah.		
-	2ab	E NCP6 PST some	naŋ teengà ke dòè guún bá time one yee wo Jaa naŋ kó kaamé e nenjé ko jawai e dúa díi. and NCP1 Jah PST go looking NCP6 food NCP8 town NCP6 war under	b Time marker	Tail 2b
			It happened one day, then Jah went looking for food in the town during the war (because they were hiding in the bush.)		
-	3ab	E NCP6 PST NCP8	teenga wo Jaa naŋ hái ko jáwái lí, time NCP1 Jah reach town the wo naŋ meŋ aŋ kaadòduà nyan ko jawái. he PST met NCP3-PL soldiers all of them	Tail-head connection	when he went to town (tail Head)
			At the time Jah reached to town, he met the soldiers in the town.		
-	4ab	Kpein Then	wó Jaa naŋ myéñ dùón siwé yé wó naŋ myenéñ ko jawa líi. NCP1 Jah PST them ran hand. and he PST hid NCP8 town near	Change of position & place Time word	when he reach to town (tail Head)
			Then Jah ran from their hands (escaped) and he hid near the town.		
-	5ab	Náan naŋ ke kaadòduà	wó Jaa yáa wó fóia gbuusáí yé aŋ naŋ kuwo. he came out openly and they him catch	Change Type & present Time marker	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
		nyanj kēē, when NCP1 Jah *** PST thinking that NCP3-PL soldiers all of them went back	When Jah was thinking that the soldiers had left, he came out of hiding (openly) and they caught him.		
	6ab		Ànj nàun tötü dàwè nyààn, "Ko nenèn mun küwa ti? they him start ask they-say "Where money you have Sèe munj go niŋ hiaŋ e doúm nàŋ jiwè." if you do not it bring we will-you*** kill	Direct 6ab change to + the repeat action	X-structure 6L - where many you have?
	6c		They began asking him saying, "Where is the money you have? If you do not bring it, we will kill you.	6ab NO marker	
	7ab		Wò naŋ myiŋ wò wààn, " Min küwa e nenèn gbiŋ siwè. he PST them said he-said I do not have NCP6 money all hand Weetil, kooneŋgìs daàngenim miŋ ka, heel!" for that please leave me go ***	Direct 7ab no marker 7ab	8abc we will beat you X-structure
	7c		He said to them he said, "I don't have any money in hand.	7C 3 don't have any money	
	8ab c		Ànj kaadòduà nyanj nyààn, " Sèe munj go wiř fè e neèn e manaj le, e doum naŋ bulò.	Direct q change to There	no marker

Pattern of the Story		No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
				NCP3-PL soldiers all of them they-say if you do not us give NCP6 we want is we will-you PST beat		
				The soldiers said, " If you don't give us the thing we want, we will beat you."		
9	Kèè		wò Jaa	kuwa wa e nèn gbin. Jah had used to NCP6 thing all	Connectors wò & 9 contrast	
				But Jah never had anything.		
10	Kpein		an naun	tsoñù bùla. they him start beat	Time word	10 began to beat him
				Then they began to beat him.		
11a bc			An nan bùlo wo Jaa kpoloò yèè naun dààngè yèè an kaadòduà nyan àn kèè ko bìl an yewè lè. they PST beat NCP1 Jah a while and they him left and NCP3-PL soldier all of them they went back NCP8 place NCP3-PL came	Chuval to P t. there beat him long time no marker	Summary statement	label
				They beat Jah for certain time, and they left him and soldiers went back to the place they came from.		

10 Parallelism

The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart A version 2 by Translator1A

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
TITLE	1		Ke dɔ̄e aŋ kaadòduà nyan naŋ wa kúwo wo Jaa le. NCP4 day NCP3-PL soldier PST used to caught NCP1 Jah is		
The day the soldiers caught Jah.					
	2ab	E naŋ teengà ke dɔ̄e guùn bà NCP6 PST time NCP4 day one some	yee wo Jaa naŋ kò kaàmè e nenjè ko jawai e dùa dìl. and NCP1 Jah PST go looking NCP6 food NCP8 town NCP6 war under		Jah went to look for food
It happened one day, then Jah went looking for food in the town during the war (because they were hiding in the bush.)					
	3ab	E teenga wo Jaa naŋ hài ko jàwài lè, NCP6 PST reach NCP8 town the	wo naŋ meen aŋ kaadòduà nyan ko jawài. he PST met NCP3-PL soldiers all of them NCP8 town		He met the soldiers
At the time Jah reached to town, he met the soldiers in the town.					
	4ab	Kpein Then	wò Jaa naŋ nyig dùòng siwè yè wò naŋ nyenèŋ ko jawa kòl. NCP1 Jah PST them ran hand. and he PST hid NCP8 town near		4ab Jah ran away from them
Then Jah ran from their hands (escaped) and he hid near the town.					
	5ab	Nààn wò Jaa yàa naŋ goongo kè aŋ kaadòduà	wo fóla gbuusàl yè aŋ nauŋ kuwo. he came out openly and they him catch		5ab he came out of hiding

When Jah was caught Jan

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis	
		nyan kèè, when NCP1 Jah *** PST thinking that NCP3-PL soldiers all of them went back				
When Jah was thinking that the soldiers had left, he came out of hiding (openly) and they caught him.						
6ab		Àŋ nàun tɔtù dàwè nyààn, "Ko nənèj munj kúwa iè?" they him start ask they-say "Where money you have	Sèè munj go niq hiaŋ e doùm nàŋ jiwè." if you do not it bring we will-you*** kill	Direct quot Speaker & listener	The begin to ask him, "Before we murder you here?	
6c		They began asking him saying, "Where is the money you have? If you do not bring it, we will kill you.				
7ab		Wò nan nyin wò wààn, " Min kúwa e nənèj gbiŋ siwè. he PST them said he-said I do not have NCP6 money all hand	Weetil, koɔneŋjè daängenim min ka, heel" for that please leave me go ***	Direct quot Speaker & listeners	7ab - Super words (Min kúwa è neen gbiŋ)	
7c		He said to them he said , "I don't have any money in hand.				
8ab c		Àŋ kaadòduà nyan nyààn, " Sèè munj go wii fe e neen e manaj ie, e doum naŋ bulò.		Direct quot Speaker & listener		

- 1. Who is in the story from beginning to end?** Jah mentioned 11 times
- 2. Who is quoted directly?** Jah and Soldiers
- 3. Who gives a command?** soldier
- 4. Who thinks about a situation and decides what needs to be done?** Jah
- 5. Who judges others in the story?** [Who decides that someone is good or bad or decides that someone is doing the right thing or doing the wrong thing?] soldier
- 6. Who solves the problem?** soldier
- 7. Who do the people in the story respond to?** [Who is the one in the story that others want to please or other people do what that person says they should?] Jah and soldier
- 8. With whom does the narrator empathize** (identify with, understand, sympathize with, have compassion)? Jah
[Is there anywhere in the story where the author tells how a participant feels? Does the author cause you to like one of the participants more than the others?]

The one who was named most often in answer to the above questions is the 'main character. Others who are named are Secondary Participant 1, Secondary Participant 2... Minor participants are usually not mentioned in answering these questions.

The main participant is Jah. He is mentioned most.

Soldier came second.

Note: Jah appeared 11 times in the story – important participant. Soldiers appear 10 times in the story – minor participant.

The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart B by Translator1A

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
TITLE	1		Ke dòk an kaadòduà nyaj nañ wa küwo wo Jaa le. NCP4 day NCP3-PL soldier PST used to caught NCP1 Jah is		Tells who the story is about and the character
The day the soldiers caught Jah.					
Setting	2ab	E nañ teengà ke dòk guùn bà NCP6 PST time NCP4 day one some	yee wo Jaa nañ kò kaàmè e nenjè ko jawal e dùa dil. and NCP1 Jah PST go looking NCP6 food NCP8 town NCP6 war under		Done know because it's time and place during the war
It happened one day, then Jah went looking for food in the town during the war (because they were hiding in the bush.)					
Plot	3ab	E teenga wo Jaa nañ hàl ko jàwàl lè, NCP6 time NCP1 Jah PST reach NCP8 town the	wo nañ mèn an kaadòduà nyaj ko jawàl. he PST met NCP3-PL soldiers all of them NCP8 town		
At the time Jah reached to town, he met the soldiers in the town.					
Increase Tension	4ab	Kpeñ Then	wò Jaa nañ nyin dùñ siwè yè wò nañ nyenjè ko jawa kòl. NCP1 Jah PST them ran hand and he PST hid NCP8 town near		
Then Jah ran from their hands (escaped) and he hid near the town.					
Major Problem	5ab	Sab Nàñ wò Jaa yàa nañ goongo kè an kaadòduà nyaj kè,	wo fola gbuusàl yè an nañ kuwo. he came out openly and they him catch		Peak Mark 5ab - 11abc

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
		when NCP1 Jah *** PST thinking that NCP3-PL soldiers all of them went back			
When Jah was thinking that the soldiers had left, he came out of hiding (openly) and they caught him.					
	6ab		An nàun toòtù dàwè nyààn, "Ko nenen mun küwa lè? they him start ask they-say "Where money you have Sèè munj go nin hian e doum nàn jiwè." if you do not it bring we will-you*** kill	Direct	6ab - short sentence
	6c				
They began asking him saying, "Where is the money you have? If you do not bring it, we will kill you.					
	7ab		Wò nan myin wòò wààn, " Min küwa e nenen gbin siwè. he PST them said he-said I do not have NCP6 money all hand	Direct	7ab - short sentence
	7c		Weetil, koosénlè daàngenim min ka, heel!" for that please leave me go ***		
He said to them he said , "I don't have any money in hand.					
	8ab c		An kaadòduà myan nyààn, " Sèè munj go wili fè e nenen e manan lè, e doum nan bulò. NCP3-PL soldiers all of them they-say if you do not us give NCP6 we want is we will-you PST beat		8abc we will beat you

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			The soldiers said, " If you don't give us the thing we want, we will beat you."		
	9	Kèè but	wò Jaa kuwa wa e nèèn gbin. Jah had used to NCP6 thing all		
	10	Kpeig Then	an naun tsotù bùla. they him start beat		10 began to beat him
	11a bc	problem solved	An nañ búlo wo Jaa kpoloò yèè an naun dààngè yèè an kaadòduà nyan àñ kèè ko bél an yewè lè. they PST beat NCP1 Jah a while and they him left and NCP3-PL soldier all of them they went back NCP8 place NCP3-PL came		Tat-Head 11abc beat him long time
			They beat Jah for certain time, and they left him and soldiers went back to the place they came from.		

The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart A by Translator 1B

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
TITLE	1		Ke dɔé aŋ kaadòdùà nyan naŋ wa kúwo wo Jaa le. NCP4 day NCP3-PL soldier PST used to caught NCP1 Jah is		by telling us about the characters of the story.
The day the soldiers caught Jah.					
Setting	2ab	E NCP6	naŋ teengà ke dɔé guùn bá PST time NCP4 day one some	yee wo Jaa naŋ kó kaàmè e nenjè ko jawai e dúa díl. and NCP1 Jah PST go looking NCP6 food NCP8 town NCP6 war under	Time marker Story may not be true because, no date, town name not mentioned.
It happened one day, then Jah went looking for food in the town during the war (because they were hiding in the bush.)					
Initial Event	3ab	E NCP6	teenga wo Jaa naŋ hái ko jáwáì lè, PST reach NCP8 town the	wo naŋ meen aŋ kaadòdùà nyan ko jawáì. he PST met NCP3-PL soldiers all of them NCP8 town	Tail-head connection 3ab Tail 3b - 4b Tail-Tail
At the time Jah reached to town, he met the soldiers in the town.					
Increase in tension	4ab	Kpein Then	wó Jaa naŋ nyin dùn siwé yéè wó naŋ nyenéñ ko jawa kóí. NCP1 Jah PST them ran hand. and he PST hid NCP8 town near	Connecting 4ab	
Then Jah ran from their hands (escaped) and he hid near the town.					
Major problem	5ab	Nààŋ wó Jaa yáa naŋ goongo ké aŋ kaadòdùà	wo fóla gbuusáì yéè aŋ nauŋ kuwo. he came out openly and they him catch	time marker 5ab connects	5ab

When day soldiers caught Jan

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
		nyanj kèè, when NCP1 Jah *** PST thinking that NCP3-PL soldiers all of them went back	When Jah was thinking that the soldiers had left, he came out of hiding (openly) and they caught him.		
6ab		Àŋ nàunj tötù dàwè nyàànj, "Ko nенèŋ munj küwa le? they him start ask they-say have Sèè munj go nínj hianj e doùm nánj jiwè." if you do not it bring we will-you*** kill	They began asking him saying, "Where is the money you have? If you do not marka No marka	X Structure Question with complete answer 6ab where is the money?	6b shout sentence
7ab		Wò nañ nyin wò wàànj, " Miŋ küwa e nенèŋ gbinj siwè. he PST them said he-said I do not have NCP6 money all hand	He said to them he said , "I don't have any money in hand.	X Structure Complete answer 7ab I don't have any money	7 c shout sent
8ab c		Àŋ kaadòduà nyanj nyàànj, " Sèè munj go wii fe e nенèŋ e mananj le, e doum nánj bulò.		8abc we will beat you No marka	

Formal story sources taught JAH					
Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
			NCP3-PL soldiers all of them they-say if you do not us give NCP6 we want is we will-you PST beat		8abc two connectors + a peak
			The soldiers said, " If you don't give us the thing we want, we will beat you."		
9	Kèè	wò Jaa	kuwa wa e nèèñ gbinj. Jah had used to NCP6 thing all		8abc & 9 Contrast 9 short connector
			But Jah never had anything.		
10	Kpein	an	naaŋ tɔtù bùla. they him start beat		10c began to beat him 10 short connector
			Then they began to beat him.		
11a bc	Problem solved	An	nan búlo wò Jaa kpoloò yèè an naaŋ dààngè yèè an kaadòduà nyan àn kèè ko bél an yewè lè. they PST beat NCP1 Jah a while and they him left and NCP3-PL soldier all of them they went back NCP8 place NCP3-PL came		repetition we will beat - 8abc began to beat - 10 beat him for long - 11abc
			They beat Jah for certain time, and they left him and soldiers went back to the place they came from.		

1. **Who is in the story from beginning to end?** Jah is in the story from beginning to end, mentioned 7 times. Jah – main character.
2. **Who is quoted directly?** Jah and Soldiers are quoted directly.
3. **Who gives a command?** The soldiers gave a command.
4. **Who thinks about a situation and decides what needs to be done?** Jah thinks about the situation
5. **Who judges others in the story?** [Who decides that someone is good or bad or decides that someone is doing the right thing or doing the wrong thing?] The soldiers judge and decided Jah was bad and was doing wrong by not showing them where the money was.
6. **Who solves the problem?** The soldiers solve the problem by beating Jah and letting him to go his way.
7. **Who do the people in the story respond to?** [Who is the one in the story that others want to please or other people do what that person says they should?] Soldiers (~~people~~) to Jah and wanted him to say what him to. (I'm not sure what was meant here.)
8. **With whom does the narrator empathize** (identify with, understand, sympathize with, have compassion)? The narrator empathize on Jah. [Is there anywhere in the story where the author tells how a participant feels? Does the author cause you to like one of the participants more than the others?]

The one who was named most often in answer to the above questions is the 'main character. Others who are named are Secondary Participant 1, Secondary Participant 2... Minor participants are usually not mentioned in answering these questions.

The main participant is Jah. He is mentioned 7 times.

Minor character are the soldiers mentioned 6 times.

Jah and the weep important prop. (Again, this is unclear.)

The Day the Soldiers Caught Jah Chart B by Translator 1B

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
TITLE	1		Ke dɔ̄e aŋ kaadòduà nyan nan wa kúwo wo Jaa le. NCP4 day NCP3-PL soldier PST used to caught NCP1 Jah is	1 Title	Ke dɔ̄e aŋ kaadòduà nyan nan wa kúwo who Jah is
			The day the soldiers caught Jah.		The day the soldiers caught Jah.
2ab	E	naj teengà ke dɔ̄o guùn̄ bá NCP6 PST time NCP4 day one some	yee wo Jaa naŋ kó kaamé e nenjé ko jawai e dúa dl. and NCP1 Jah PST go looking NCP6 food NCP8 town NCP6 war under	B - Beginning of Story	Zg. Wo Jaa naj ko kaamé e neje Jah went looking for food.
			It happened one day, then Jah went looking for food in the town during the war (because they were hiding in the bush.)		
3ab	E	teenga wo Jaa naŋ hái ko jàwài lè, NCP6 time NCP1 Jah PST reach NCP8 town the	wo nan meen aŋ kaadòduà nyan ko jawài. he PST met NCP3-PL soldiers all of them NCP8 town	Time marker Tail-head connector	
			At the time Jah reached to town, he met the soldiers in the town.		
4ab	Kpein Then		wò Jaa naŋ nyiŋ dùŋ siwè yè wò nan nyenéŋ ko jawa kòi. NCP1 Jah PST them ran hand. and he PST hid NCP8 town near	Change of participant & place time word	Han-dùŋ siwè ran from them
			Then Jah ran from their hands (escaped) and he hid near the town.		
Major Proble	Sab	Nàŋ wò Jaa yà nan goongo kè aŋ kaadòduà nyan kɛ̄,	wo fola gbuusàì yè aŋ naŋ kuwo. he came out openly and they him catch	Change of time & change of participant time marker	Sab - II abc peak mark .. sa-fola gbuusàì came out

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary Marker	Analysis
		when NCP1 Jah *** PST thinking that NCP3-PL soldiers all of them went back	When Jah was thinking that the soldiers had left, he came out of hiding (openly) and they caught him.		
	6ab		Àŋ nàun̄ tɔtù dàwè nyààn̄, "Ko nənèñ mun̄ kúwa lè? they him start ask they-say "Where money you have	Direct quote Speaker & Listener	6a- + >> tì dawé begin to asker
	6c		Sèè mun̄ go nñ̄ hñ̄ñ e dòum nñ̄ jiwè?" if you do not it bring we will-you*** kill		change of time & event
			They began asking him saying, "Where is the money you have? If you do not bring it, we will kill you.		No marker
	7ab		Wò nñ̄ nyñ̄ wào wàan̄, " Mñ̄ kúwa e nenèñ gbiñ siwè, he PST them said he-said I do not have NCP6 money all hand	Direct quote Speaker Listener	7ab - super words - I don't have any more No m.
	7c		Weetii, koñeñjé daàngenim mñ̄ ka, heel" for that please leave me go ***	Normal/cer	
			He said to them he said, "I don't have any money in hand.		
	8ab c		Àŋ kaadòduà nyñ̄ nyààn̄, " Sèè mun̄ go wñ̄ fè e neñ̄ e manan̄ le, e dòum nñ̄ bulò. NCP3-PL soldiers all of them they-say if you do not us give NCP6 we want is we will-you PST beat	Direct quote Speaker & Listener	Change of theme No marker

the many soldiers caught Jan

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			The soldiers said, " If you don't give us the thing we want, we will beat you."		
	9	Kèè but	wò Jaa kuwa wa e nèèñ gbìñ. Jah had used to NCP6 thing all	Connecting	q super word never had anything
	10	Kpeñj Then	əñ naun tɔɔtù bùla. they him start beat	time word	
			Then they began to beat him.		
11a bc		Problem solved	An nan búlo wo Jaa kpoloò yèè an naun dààngè yèè an kaadòduà nyàn àn kèè ko bëi an yewè lè. they PST beat NCP1 Jah a while and they him left and NCP3-PL soldier all of them they went back NCP8 place NCP3-PL came	Change of Participant & Theme	5 ab-11. 1 lab crossing & problem solved àñ nay búlo wé Jah.
			They beat Jah for certain time, and they left him and soldiers went back to the place they came from.	Summary statement	The beat Jah.

Complaint from the Farm Chart A

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint From the Farm.	Speech, Word Order	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
Title	1		E zàò Yìwìà Ko bùi NCP6 complaint from NCP8		
A complaint from the farm.					
Setting	2ab	Ke dòò guùŋ bà, NCP4 day one some	<p>Vaàniìŋ naŋ nyàaŋ wo Mùsu yaà Jèbè yèè wò</p> <p>Varney PST call NCP1 Musu she</p> <p>and Jebbeh and he PST</p> <p>them told saying</p> <p>"Mìŋ manaŋ wèè naim kpuumàŋ naŋ hèè e jɔ mè</p> <p>bà ko bùi."</p> <p>I want for you and me help youPl cut NCP6 rice me some NCP8 farm</p>	Speaker, listener, speech word before quote. SVO, SO(pronoun)V	Direct quote in Setting PR – 2a Object nouns after verb, 2b object pronoun before verb. Main character and major participants are not introduced.
	2c		One day, Varney called Musu and Jebbeh and he told them saying, "I want you to help me (you) cut rice for me on the farm."		
	3a		Wo Mùsu yaà Jèbè naŋ nyimèè. NCP1 Musu she-and Jebbeh PST agree		
Jebbeh and Musu agreed.					
Initial Event	4		E nìiŋ naŋ sìe yèè àŋ naŋ kò ko bù	SV, SVPlace	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint From the Farm.	Speech, Word Order	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
			Vaàniin. NCP6 day PST break and they PST go NCP8 farm Varney		
			(When) Day broke and they went to Varney's farm.		
5ab		Ke dàjì yii, NCP4 day that	wo Jèbè naŋ hèè maŋ jò màŋ nɔɔnɔŋ leè taai yè wo Mùsu naŋ hèè màŋ zìiyà. NCP1 Jebbeh PST cut NCP5-PL rice bunch five and three and NCP1 Musu PST cut the ten 0	TimeSVO, SVO	
			That day Jebbeh harvested 8 bunches of rice and Musu cut 10.		
6ab		Ke wèè aŋ dèlà naŋ le jɔ lè ko goìlìi, but for them carry now NCP7 rice the NCP8 kitchen	maŋ jò màŋ taai màŋ go wo Mùsu sìwè. rice bunch three they lost NCP1 Musu hand.	TimeSV	
			While they were carrying the rice to the kitchen, three of Musu's bunches got lost.		
Increasing tension	7a		Wò naŋ dàwè wo Jèbè, she PST ask NCP1 Jebbeh Jèbè wààŋ, "Miŋ nyimàŋ ekè è jɔum bà."	Direct quote speaker, listener speech verb 'saying' before quote SVO 7a SV, SVO 7bc	Direct quote in Increasing Tension section
	7bc				

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint From the Farm.	Speech, Word Order	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
			Jebbeh saying I don't know about rice-your some		
			(When) she asked Jebbeh, Jebbeh said, I don't know about your rice."		
Major Problems	8ab		E keì bi naŋ jèlè Mùsu yèè wò naŋ fè e zàò wo Vaàniin wèè e jœun ne. NCP6 problem that PST hurt Musu and she PST give NCP6 complaint NCP1 Varney for NCP6 rice-her it	SVO, SVOlo	PEAK 8-16 Fewer connectors in Peak than in Initial Event.
			This problem hurt Musu and she gave the complaint to Varney for her rice.		
	9ab		Wo Vaàniin naŋ nyààŋ wo Jèbè yèè wò nauŋ dawè wààŋ, NCP1 Varney PST called NCP1 Jebbeh and he her ask saying8	Speaker, listener, 2 speech words in long quote formula before quote SVO, SOVV	Called, asked, saying: repetition Vivid Ig 8 problem hurt Musu, gave complaint
	9cd		"Jèbè, wo Mùsu wààŋ maŋ jçò mààŋ taai naŋ go e jœun nè sùà māŋ nyimàŋ e kii miŋ?" Jebbeh NCP1 Musu said NCP5-PL rice bunch three PST do not NCP6 rice-her the in you know NCP6 about them		Question with an answer that is a whole sentence. PR '3 rice bunches' = an important prop, so they are mentioned with a noun phrase in 6,7,8,9,10,11 (6 times) before a pronoun is used.
			(Then) Varney called Jebbeh and he asked her saying, "Jebbeh, Musu is saying three of her rice bunch got lost. Do you know about it?"		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint From the Farm.	Speech, Word Order	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
	10a		Wo Jebbe wààn, NCP1 Jebbeh said	Speaker, speech word 'said' before direct quote	
Problems Solved	10b		"Hèèèñ, wò naim weè woò wààn, 'Wò yaà bème sùà maj jòò mààn taai wo mìñ fè wo jàwè Vaàniòñwè wo jùà e gbòù.' yes she me for told saying she was taking in NCP5-PL rice bunch three she them give NCP1 wife Varney for she beat NCP6 bread	Long quote with embedded indirect quote	
			Jebbeh said, "Yes, she told me saying, 'She was taking the three rice bunches to give them to Varney's wife to make bread.'		
	11ab		Weètii wò nan gè maj jòò mààn taai mìn le jòò lè sùa yèè wò nañ niñ jàà è gbà. for this she PST take NCP5-PL rice bunch three rice the in and she PST it set it different.		
			So she took three rice bunches ? and she set them aside.		
	12abc		Nààñ pεε mìñ gbooo yaà lε, kòò è jaa e jòò		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint From the Farm.	Speech, Word Order	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
			<p style="text-align: center;">kpàlaè sùà sabù kè wò naŋ nyεεŋ wè wo nin hiàn."</p> <p>as even I speak here is still it sitting NCP6 rice straw in because that she PST forget for she it bring</p>		
			Even as I speak, (it?) still sitting in the rice straw because she forgot to bring it. "		
	13a		<p>Wo Vaàniŋ naŋ dàwè Mùsu wààŋ, NCP1 Varney PST ask Musu saying</p>	Speaker, listener, 2 speech words before quote	
	13b		"Mùsu, tii naŋ kaiñ ?" Musu that PST walk		
			Varney asked Musu saying, "Musu, Is that what happened?"		
	14a		<p>Wo Mùsu wààŋ, NCP1 Musu saying</p>	Speaker, speech word 'saying' before quote	
	14b		<p>Hèεεŋ etɔɔbaa le kεε mìn naŋ nyεεnɛŋ weè tii jòaŋ ehakè." yes it true is but I PST forget for that take you sorry</p>		
			Musu said, "Yes, it is true, but I forgot to bring it. Sorry."		
	15a	Kpeŋ Then	wo Vaàniŋ naŋ wòò Mùsu wààŋ,		wòò is this glossed correctly?

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint From the Farm.	Speech, Word Order	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
			NCP1 Varney PST saying Musu saying	Speaker, listener, 2 speech words(?) →	
	15b		Munj gò nyènèn tèè kobè Jèbèi weètii Jèbè, hùànè you not do good to Jebbeh for this Jebbeh sorry	before quote	
			Then Varney said to Musu saying, "You did not do good to Jebbeh, So Jebbeh (sorry for what happened ?)		
	16a		Dàngè tii gbiŋ. leave that all		
			Just forget about it all!"		
Closing	17	Yèè And/then	wo Jèbè naŋ nyimèè e keiɛ naŋ jùò aŋ naŋ kɛɛ ko vàai àŋ yaà giiyè e zɔlì. NCP1 Jebbeh PST agree NCP6 problem PST finish they PST went back NCP8 village they are taking out NCP6 joy		
			So/Then Jebbeh agreed and the problem finished. They went back to the village, they were rejoicing.		

1. Who is in story from beginning to end? Varney, Musu, Jebbeh
2. Who is quoted directly? Varney (Initial event, solving process, question to Musu, instruction to Musu and to Jebbeh) Jebbeh (problem incited, solving process) Musu (admittance)
3. Who gives a command? Varney

4. Who thinks about a situation and decides what needs to be done? Varney
5. Who judges others in the story? [Who decides that someone is good or bad or decides that someone is doing the right thing or doing the wrong thing?] Varney
6. Who solves the problem? Jebbeh has the answer, but Varney is the one who draws it out.
7. Who do the people in the story respond to? [Who is the one in the story that others want to please or other people do what that person says they should?] Varney
8. With whom does the narrator empathize (identify with, understand, sympathize with, have compassion)? Jebbeh
[Is there anywhere in the story where the author tells how a participant feels? Does the author cause you to like one of the participants more than the others?]

The one who was named most often in answer to the above questions is the 'main character. Others who are named are Secondary Participant 1, Secondary Participant 2... Minor participants are usually not mentioned in answering these questions.

Main character is Varney,

Secondary participant 1 is Jebbeh

Secondary participant 2 is Musu.

Props: 3 bunches of rice, rice farm, kitchen

How are participants introduced?

- **Is 'one' or 'a certain...' used to introduce the main character?** No the names are given like the audience already knows them.
- **Is the main character introduced before he does anything in the story?** All the participants are named in the first sentence
- **Is the main character introduced with more words than the other participants?** No, but he gets a more elaborate quotation device "he told or asked them, saying" where as Jebbeh got "Jebbeh saying" both times. Musu also uses the short form.
- **Are the main character and the major participants introduced before the verb or after the verb?** Varney is the subject and Musu and Jebbeh are the audience and are placed after the verb. (language is SVO with nouns for objects, but object pronouns precede the verb.)

How are participants referred to?

Varney: Name 6 x (4 of these had NCP), Name in possessive phrase, pronoun only 1x

total 7x

Musu: Name 8x (5 of these had NCP), pronoun only2x, plural pronoun 2x, poss prn 1x

total 13x

Jebbeh: Name 8x (5 of these had NCP), plural pronoun 2x, poss prn 1x

total 11x

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Name, Noun, Noun</u>	<u>Name, Noun, Noun</u>	<u>Name, Noun, Noun</u>	<u>Pronoun</u>
<u>Phrase</u>	<u>Phrase + Pronoun when introduced</u>	<u>Phrase + Pronoun AFTER being introduced</u>		
Varney	6	Name	5	1
Musu	8	name	7	5
Jebbeh	8	name	7	3

Observations: Introducing participants: Names are used to introduce. Varney is mentioned less but gets more quotations. Musu gets more mentions but speaks less than Jebbeh. What does it mean when the NCPs are missing? This seems to be related to the fact that names are used.

How are participants followed through a story? Names are used a lot to keep track of people. Only Musu and Jebbeh are combined in the plural pronoun. '3 rice bunches' are an important prop, so they are mentioned with a noun phrase in 6,7,8,9,10,11 (6 times) before a pronoun is used.

Complaint from the Farm Chart B

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint from the Farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
		Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh			
Title	1		E zàò Yiwìà Ko bùi NCP6 complaint from NCP8 farm		
A complaint from the farm.					
Setting	2ab	Ke dōj guùn bà, day one NCP4 some	Vààniìŋ naŋ nyàan wo Mùsu yaà Jèbè yèè wò naŋ nyiŋ woò wààŋ, Varney PST call NCP1 Musu she and Jebbeh and he PST them told saying	Time marker	B-Beginning of story tells time when it happened, 'One day' THEME (whole story): Musu lost 3 bunches of rice (6) and blamed Jebbeh (7), who had picked rice with her (2). When she complained to Varney (8), Jebbeh told him that Musu had set aside 3 bunches for Varney's wife to make
	2c				

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint from the Farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
			"Mìŋ mananj wèè naim kpuumàŋ naŋ hèè e jɔɔ mè bà ko bùi." I want for you and me help youPl cut NCP6 rice me some NCP8 farm		bread (10,11). Musu apologized (14) and the problem was finished (17).
			One day, Varney called Musu and Jebbeh and he told them saying, "I want you to help me (you) cut rice for me on the farm."		
	3a		Wo Mùsu yaà Jèbè naŋ nyimèè. NCP1 Musu she-and Jebbeh PST agree	No marker	
			Jebbeh and Musu agreed.		
Initial Event	4		E nìinj naŋ sìe yèè àŋ naŋ kò ko bù Vaàniinj. NCP6 day PST break and they PST go NCP8 farm Varney	No marker	B-Change of place (farm), participants (No Varney), time
			(When) Day broke and they went to Varney's farm.		
	5ab	Ke dɔɔ yii, NCP4 day that	wo Jèbè naŋ hèè maŋ jɔɔ màŋ nɔɔnɔŋ leè taai yèè wo Mùsu naŋ hèè màŋ ziiyà.	Time marker	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint from the Farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
			NCP1 Jebbeh PST cut NCP5-PL rice bunch five and three and NCP1 Musu PST cut the ten 0		
			That day Jebbeh harvested 8 bunches of rice and Musu cut 10.		
6ab	Kε wèè aŋ dèlā naànj le jɔ̄ lè ko goiili, but for them carry now NCP7 rice the NCP8 kitchen	maŋ jò̄ mǎàŋ taai mǎŋ go wo Mùsu sìwè. rice bunch three they lost NCP1 Musu hand.	Time marker/possible tail-head		
		While they were carrying the rice to the kitchen, three of Musu's bunches got lost.			
Increasing tension	7a 7bc		Wò naŋ dàwè wo Jèbè, she PST ask NCP1 Jebbeh Jèbè wààŋ, "Min nyimààŋ ekèè è jɔ̄um bà." Jebbeh saying I don't know about rice-your some	Time marker(?)	Direct quote in Increasing Tension section
		(When) she asked Jebbeh, Jebbeh said, I don't know about your rice."			
Major Problems	8ab		E keì bi naŋ jèlè Mùsu yèè wò naŋ fè e zàò wo	No Marker	PEAK 8-16 B-Change of participants, place?, action (quotation to event), PST marker.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint from the Farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
			<p>Vààniìŋ wèè e jɔɔn̩ nɛ. NCP6 problem that PST hurt Musu and she PST give NCP6 complaint NCP1 Varney for NCP6 rice- her it</p>		Fewer connectors in Peak than in Initial Event.
			This problem hurt Musu and she gave the complaint to Varney for her rice.		
	9ab		<p>Wo Vaàniìŋ naŋ nyààŋ wo Jèbè yèè wò nauŋ dawè wààŋ, NCP1 Varney PST called NCP1 Jebbeh and he her ask saying</p>	No marker	Called, asked, saying: repetition Vivid Ig 8 problem hurt Musu, gave complaint
	9cd		<p>"Jèbè, wo Mùsu wààŋ maŋ jòò màaŋ taai naŋ go e jɔɔn̩ nɛ sùà màŋ nyìmàn e kii miŋ?" Jebbeh NCP1 Musu said NCP5-PL rice bunch three PST do not NCP6 rice-her the in you know NCP6 about them</p>		Speaker, listener, <u>2 speech words</u> in long quote formula before quote Question with an answer that is a whole sentence.
			(Then) Varney called Jebbeh and he asked her saying, "Jebbeh, Musu is saying three of her rice bunch got lost. Do you know about it?"		
	10a		Wo Jèbè wààŋ,	No marker	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint from the Farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
Problems Solved	10b		<p>NCP1 Jebbeh said</p> <p>"Hèèèñ, wò naim weè woò wàñ, 'Wò yaà bème sùà mañ jòò mààñ taai wo miñ fè wo jàwè Vaànñçñwèè wo jùà e gboù.' yes she me for told saying she was taking in NCP5-PL rice bunch three she them give NCP1 wife Varney for she beat NCP6 bread</p>		Long quote with embedded indirect quote
			Jebbeh said, "Yes, she told me saying, 'She was taking the three rice bunches to give them to Varney's wife to make bread.'		
	11ab		<p>Weètii wò nañ gè mañ jòò mààñ taai màñ le jøò lè sùa yèè wò nañ niñ jàà è gbà. for this she PST take NCP5-PL rice bunch three rice the in and she PST it set it different.</p>		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint from the Farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
			So she took three rice bunches ? and she set them aside.		
12abc			<p>Nààŋ pεε mìn gboo yaà lε, kòò è jaa e jɔɔ kpàlaè sùà sabù kε wò nan nyɛɛŋ wèè wo niŋ hiàŋ."</p> <p>as even I speak here is still it sitting NCP6 rice straw in because that she PST forget for she it bring</p>		
			Even as I speak, (it?) still sitting in the rice straw because she forgot to bring it."		
13a			<p>Wo Vaàniŋ naŋ dàwè Mùsu wààn,</p> <p>NCP1 Varney PST ask Musu saying</p>	No marker	B-Change of speaker <u>2 speech words</u>
13b			"Mùsu, tii naŋ kàin ?" Musu that PST walk		
			Varney asked Musu saying, "Musu, Is that what happened?"		
14a			<p>Wo Mùsu wààn, NCP1 Musu saying</p>	No marker	B-Change of speaker
14b			"Héɛɛŋ etɔɔbaa le kεε mìn naŋ nyɛɛnɛŋ weè tii jòaŋ ehakè."		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint from the Farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh		
			yes it true is but I PST forget for that take you sorry		
			Musu said, "Yes, it is true, but I forgot to bring it. Sorry."		
15a	Kpeij Then		wo Vaàniìŋ naŋ wòò Mùsu wààn, NCP1 Varney PST saying Musu saying	Time word	B-Change of speaker wòò is this glossed correctly? <u>2 speech words(?)</u>
15b			Muŋ gò nyènèŋ tèè kobè Jèbè weètii Jèbè, hùànè you not do good to Jebbeh for this Jebbeh sorry		
			Then Varney said to Musu saying, "You did not do good to Jebbeh, So Jebbeh (sorry for what happened ?)		
16a			Dàngè tii gbiŋ." leave that all		
			Just forget about it all"		
Closing	17	Yèè And/then	wo Jèbè naŋ nyimèè e keiɛ naŋ jùò aŋ naŋ kèè ko vaaì àŋ yaà giyyè e zɔlò. NCP1 Jebbeh PST agree NCP6 problem PST finish they PST went back NCP8 village they are taking out NCP6 joy	Connecting word Yèè 'And/then'	B-Change of participants, place, action (Quote to events)

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L1 analysis pre-workshop A Complaint from the Farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
		Quote formula, direct quote. Varney, Musu, Jebbeh Musu and Jebbeh			
		(So/Then) Jebbeh agreed and the problem finished. They went back to the village, they were rejoicing.			

Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers in a Natural Story and a Bible story (Table is part of chart analysis.)

	L1 “Complaint from the Farm” Story	Mark 5:1-20
No marker	4,8,10,13,14 = 5	
Connecting word	‘And/then’ 17 = 1	
Time word	15 = 1	
Time marker		
Location marker		
Tail-head connection		
Marker that points back		
Burger structure		
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: Most of the paragraphs in the natural story begin with no marker. One time word ‘Kpeinj’ ‘Then’ is used and the word Yèè, ‘And/then,’ which could be a connecting word or time word is used at the beginning of the Closing.

Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within the paragraphs in a Natural Story and a Bible story

	L1 “Complaint from the Farm” Story	Mark 5:1-20
No marker	3,9 = 2	
Connecting word		
Time word		
Time marker	5,6,7(?),= 3	
Location marker		
Tail-head connection		
Marker that points back		
Burger structure		
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: No marker or a time marker are the most-used ways to begin a sentence within an L1 paragraph. The “Jah” story also uses one connecting word and one time marker. More stories need to be studied in order to know if there are other markers that can be used with natural L1 stories, and whether they prefer to have no marker or a time marker at the beginning of sentences within most paragraphs.

Complaint from the Farm Chart for Analysis²

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 for analysis by team A complaint from the farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
	1		E zàò Yìwìà Ko bùi NCP6 complaint from NCP8 farm		
A complaint from the farm.					
	2ab	Ke dòò guùn bà, NCP4 day one some	Vaàníñ nañ nyàaŋ wo Mùsu yaà Jèbè yè wò nañ nyíñ woò wàaŋ, Varney PST call NCP1 Musu she and Jebbeh and he PST them told saying		
	2c		"Mìñ manañ wèè naim kpuumàñ nañ hèè e jɔo mè bà ko bùi." I want for you and me help youPL cut NCP6 rice me some NCP8 farm		
One day, Varney called Musu and Jebbeh and he told them saying, "I want you to help me (you) cut rice for me on the farm."					
	3a		Wo Mùsu yaà Jèbè nañ nyimèè. NCP1 Musu and Jebbeh PST agree		
Jebbeh and Musu agreed.					
	4		E nìñ nañ sie yè àŋ nañ kò ko bù Vaàníñ. NCP6 day PST break and they PST go NCP8 farm Varney		
(When) Day broke and they went to the farm.					

² For the sake of space, only one of the charts with blank analysis columns is reproduced here and in the following sections. Teams were given two charts where column 5 was labeled for analysis of the speech quotations and word order or for the boundary markers and connectors.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 for analysis by team A complaint from the farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
	5ab	Ke 澧 yi, NCP4 day that	wo Jèbè naŋ hèè maŋ jòò màŋ nɔɔnɔŋ leè taai yèè wo Mùsu naŋ hèè màŋ zìiyà. NCP1 Jebbeh PST cut NCP5-PL rice bunch five and three and NCP1 Musu PST cut the ten		
			Free That day Jebbeh harvested 8 bunches of rice and Musu cut 10.		
	6ab	Ke wèè dèlā aŋ naŋ le jɔɔ lè ko but goìllìi, for them now rice the kitchen NCP7 NCP8	maŋ jòò màŋ taaí màŋ go wo Mùsu sìwè. rice bunch three they lost NCP1 Musu hand.		
			While they were carrying the rice to the kitchen, three of Musu's bunches got lost.		
	7a		Wò naŋ dàwè wo Jèbè, she PST ask NCP1 Jebbeh		
	7bc		Jèbè wààŋ, "Miŋ nyimààŋekèè è jɔum Jebbeh saying I don't know about some rice-your" some		
			(When) she asked her Jebbeh said, I don't know about your rice."		
	8ab		E keì bi naŋ jèlè Mùsu yèè wò naŋ fè e zàò wo Vaàniŋ wèè e jɔɔnɔŋ nɛ.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 for analysis by team A complaint from the farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			NCP6 problem that PST hurt Musu and she PST give NCP6 complaint NCP1 Varney for NCP6 rice-her it		
			This problem hurt Musu and she gave the complaint to Varney for her rice.		
	9ab		Wo Vaàniìŋ naŋ nyààn wo Jèbè yè wò naun dawè wààŋ, Jebbeh and NCP1 Varney PST called NCP1 Jebbeh he her ask saying		
	9cd		"Jèbè, wo Mùsu wààŋ maŋ jòò mààŋ taai naŋ go e jɔɔŋ nè sùà māŋ nyìmàŋ e kii miŋ?" Jebbeh NCP1 Musu said NCP5-PL rice bunch three PST do not NCP6 rice-her the in you know NCP6 about them		
			(Then) Varney called Jebbeh and asked her saying, " Jebbeh, Musu is saying some of her rice got lost. Do you know about it?"		
	10a		Wo Jèbè wààŋ, NCP1 Jebbeh said		
	10b		"Héeeŋ, wò naim weè woò wààŋ, 'Wò yaà bème sùà maŋ jòò mààŋ taai wo miŋ fè wo jàwè Vaàniìŋwèè wo jùà e gboù.' yes she me for told saying rice she was taking in NCP5-PL bunch three she them give NCP1 wife Varney for she beat NCP6 bread		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 for analysis by team A complaint from the farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Jebbeh said, "Yes, she told me saying, 'She was taking the three rice bunches to give them to Varney's wife to make bread.'		
	11ab		Weètii wò naŋ gè maŋ jòò mààn <small>j</small> taai màŋ le jɔɔ lè sùa yèè wò naŋ niŋ jàà è gbà. for this she PST take NCP5-PL rice bunch three rice the in and she PST it set it different.		
			So she took three rice bunches ? and she set them aside.		
	12abc		Nààŋ pεε mìn gboo yaà lε, kòò è jaa e jɔɔ kpàlaɛ sùà sabù kè wò naŋ nyɛɛŋ wèè wo niŋ hiàn." as even I speak here is still it sitting NCP6 rice straw in because that she PST forget for she it bring		
			Even as I speak, (it?) still sitting in the rice straw because she forgot to bring it. "		
	13a		Wo Vaàniŋ naŋ dàwè Mùsu wààŋ, NCP1 Varney PST ask Musu saying		
	13b		"Mùsu, tii naŋ kaìn ?" Musu that PST walk		
			Varney asked Musu saying, "Musu, Is that what happened?"		
	14a		Wo Mùsu wààŋ, NCP1 Musu saying		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L1 for analysis by team A complaint from the farm.	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
	14b		"Hèèñ etçobaa le kεε mìñ nañ nyεenèñ weè tii jòañ ehakè." yes it true is but I PST forget for that take_you sorry		
Musu said, "Yes, it is true, but I forgot to bring it. Sorry."					
	15a	Kpein Then	wo Vaàniñ nañ wòò Mùsu wààñ, NCP1 Varney PST saying Musu saying		
	15b		Muñ gó nyènèñ tèè kobè Jèbèi weètii Jèbè, hùànè you not do good to Jebbeh for this Jebbeh sorry		
			Then Varney said to Musu saying, "You did not do good to Jebbeh, So Jebbeh (sorry for what happened ?)		
	16a		Dàngè tii gbin." leave that all		
			Just forget about it all"		
	17	Yèè And/then	wo Jèbè nañ nyimèè e keiñ nañ jùò añ nañ kèè ko vāàì añ yaà giyyè e zɔlò. NCP1 Jebbeh PST agree NCP6 problem PST finish they PST went back NCP8 village they are taking out NCP6 joy		
			So/Then Jebbeh agreed and the problem finished. They went back to the village, they were rejoicing.		

Complaint from the Farm Chart A by Translator 1C³

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
Title	1		E zàò Yíwìà Ko bùl NCP6 complaint from NCP8 farm		The title tells me what the story is all about.
Setting	2ab	Ke dōo guūn bà, NCP4 day one some	Vàanlin[nan] nyàn wo Mùsu yàa Jèbè yèe wo Varney PST call NCP1 Musu she and Jebbeh and he PST them told saying	Speaker/listener told, saying speech word listener	The story is true. You get to know that from the event on the farm. It is something farmers do every year asking for help.
Setting	2c		"Mìñ manaj wèè naim kpuumàn nan hèe e joo mè bà ko bùl." Varney I want for you and me help youPI cut NCP6 rice me some NCP8 farm	direct quote asking for help question help & develop the theme	asking for help
Setting	3a		Wo Mùsu yàa Jèbè nan nyimèè. NCP1 Musu and Jebbeh PST agree	no marker	
Initial event	4		nlín nan sie yèè àñ nan kò ko bù Vaanlin. NCP6 day PST break and they PST go NCP8 farm Varney	time marker	No connector in the initial event
Setting	5ab	Ke dōo yil, that	(When) Day broke and they went to the farm. wo Jèbè nan hèe man jòò màñ ncoññ leè taal yèè wo Mùsu nan hèe màñ zìyà. NCP1 Jebbeh PST cut NCPS-PL rice bunch five and three and NCP1 Musu PST cut the ten	time marker connector	B Time, place, action figure of speech
Free That day Jebbeh harvested 8 bunches of rice and Musu cut 10.					

³ Only chart a is shown as chart b was incomplete.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
Initial event	6ab	Ké wèè aŋ dèlā nañ le jɔj lè ko go illi, but for them carry now NCP7 rice the NCP8 kitchen	man jɔj māñ taaí māñ go wo Mūsu rice bunch three they lost NCP1 Musu hand.	time marker	Contrast 6ab to 5ab figures speech
			While they were carrying the rice to the kitchen, three of Musu's bunches got lost.	marker	
Developing Conflict	7a		Wò nañ dàwè wo Jèbè, she PST ask NCP1 Jebbeh	Speaker Listener direct quote	question follow by answer - 7a
	7bc		Jèbè wàñ, "Mìñ nyimàñ ekè è jɔum bà." Jebbeh saying I don't know about rice-your some	Speaker No marker	
			(When) she asked her Jebbeh said, I don't know about your rice."	marker	B action, place
major problem	8ab		E kei bl nañ jèlè Mūsu yè wò nañ fè e zàò wo Vañññ wè e jɔum ne. NCP6 problem that PST hurt Musu and she PST give NCP6 complaint NCP1 Varney for NCP6 rice-herit	No marker	peak 8-14 direct quote vivid lang.
			This problem hurt Musu and she gave the complaint to Varney for her rice.		
	9ab		Wo Vañññ nañ nyàñ wo Jèbè yè wò nañ dawè wàñ,	no marker	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
			NCP1 Varney PST called NCP1 Jebbeh and he her ask saying		
9cd			"Jèbè, wo Mùsu wààn, manj jùù - mààn taai nan go e jéonù nè suà mànj nyimànj e kil min?" Jebbeh NCP1 Musu said NCP5-PL rice bunch three PST do not NCP6 rice-herthe in you know NCP6 about them	direct quote Varney asking for clarity repeated qcd, 10cd, 11cd Question ask qcd	Rice bunches are
			(Then) Varney called Jebbeh and asked her saying, "Jebbeh, Musu is saying some of her rice got lost. Do you know about it?"	marker	There are NO connector in the peak but quotations
10a			Wo Jèbè wààn, NCP1 Jebbeh said	speaker speech word	No marker
10b			"Hèèn, wò naim weè woò wààn, 'Wò yaà bèmè suà manj jùù mààn taai wo min fè wo jàwè Vaànññ wèè wo jùù e gboù.' yes she me for told saying she was taking in NCP5-PL rice bunch three she them give NCP1 wife Varney for she beat NCP6 bread	direct quote Speaker No marker	repeated action Varney ask Jebbeh Musu answer 8ab Musu ask Jebbeh Jebbeh answer -7a
			Jebbeh said, "Yes, she told me saying, 'She was taking the three rice bunches to give them to Varney's wife to make bread.'	no marker	Q - complete answer 10b
11a b			Weètil wò nanj gè manj jùù mààn taai manj - le joo lè suà yèè wò nanj ninj jàà è gbà. for this she PST take NCP5-PL rice bunch three rice the in and she PST it set it different.	No marker	
			So she took three rice bunches ? and she set them aside.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
	12a bc		Nààŋ pèe mìn gboo yaà le, kòò è jaa e joo kpàlae sùà sabù kè wò nan nyeɛn wèè wo niŋ hiàn." as even I speak here is still it sitting NCP6 rice straw in because that she PST forget for she it bring	direct quote speaker	
			Even as I speak, (it?) still sitting in the rice straw because she forgot to bring it.		Participant B quotation
	13a		Wo Vaànlìŋnan dàwè Mùsu wààn, NCP1 Varney PST ask Musu saying	speech word	
	13b		"Mùsu, tii nan kain ?" Musu that PST walk	direct quote speaker listener	question follow by answer 13b, 14b
			Varney asked Musu saying, "Musu, Is that what happened?"		
	14a		Wo Mùsu wààn, NCP1 Musu saying	speaker	no marker
problem solve	14b		"Hèèn̄ etɔbaale kɛe mìn nan nyenèn wèè til jɔalŋ ehakè." yes it true is but I PST forget for that take you sorry	direct quote speaker	direct quotes
			Musu said, "Yes, it is true, but I forgot to bring it. Sorry."		
flow problem solve	15a	Kpein Then	wo Vaànlìŋnan wò Mùsu wààn, NCP1 Varney PST saying Musu saying	speaker speech word	time word no marker
	15b		Muŋ gó nyenèn tèe kobè Jèbèi weètii Jèbè, huànè you not do good to Jebbeh for this Jebbeh sorry	speaker direct quote listener	
			Then Varney said to Musu saying, "You did not do good to Jebbeh, So Jebbeh (sorry for what happened ?)		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
	16a		Dàngè tī gbin." leave that all Just forget about it all!"		place participant S. action
	17	Yèè And/then	<p>wo Jèbè nan nyimèè e keè nan jùò an nan kèè ko vaaì àn yaà gilyè e zɔlò. NCP1 Jebbeh PST agree NCP6 problem PST finish they PST went back NCP8 village they are taking out NCP6 joy</p> <p><i>closing</i></p>	<p>no marker Connector</p>	<p>summary statement Jebbeh agree and the matter was over. The went back to the village happy</p>
			So/Then Jebbeh agreed and the problem finished. They went back to the village, they were rejoicing.		

1. Who is in the story from beginning to end? Varney, Jebbeh, Musu
2. Who is quoted directly? Jebbeh, Musu, Varney
3. Who gives a command? Varney
4. Who thinks about a situation and decides what needs to be done? Varney
5. Who judges others in the story? [Who decides that someone is good or bad or decides that someone is doing the right thing or doing the wrong thing?] Varney
6. Who solves the problem? Varney
7. Who do the people in the story respond to? [Who is the one in the story that others want to please or other people do what that person says they should?] Musu and Varney
8. With whom does the narrator empathize (identify with, understand, sympathize with, have compassion)? Jebbeh
 [Is there anywhere in the story where the author tells how a participant feels? Does the author cause you to like one of the participants more than the others?]

The one who was named most often in answer to the above questions is the 'main character. Others who are named are Secondary Participant 1, Secondary Participant 2... Minor participants are usually not mentioned in answering these questions.

The main participant is Varney.

The secondary participant is Jebbeh.

Secondary participant 2 is Musu.

Language 2

Zahn Town Chart A⁴

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story- L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town					Analysis of Quotes	Comments
		<u>Quote formula, direct quote, Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero</u>							
Episode 1, Opening	1		Wɔ́ zii gǎlé à gbɛ́ɛ́ɛ́ lε Zǎǎ pèlè mò́ story is 3s about and Zahn town on						
This is a story about the town of Zahn.									
	2		Vɔmì Máfiù Gɔ́pɛ́í lé a gèea . Evangelist Matthew Gopen is 3s narrator						
Evangelist Matthew Gopen is the narrator.									
Setting 1a	3		E kε Gĩnè gɔ́ doó káa , o kε à si pìà Zǎǎ. 3s were Guinea man one with 3p be/do 3s calling Zahn						
There was a Guinea man who was called Zahn.									
	4	Yé aà péle dɔ́o, when 3s town build	léè à tókpo e dià mò Zǎǎ . then 3s name 3s self on Zahn						

⁴ This story was used only for analysis by workshop leaders to use as examples of workshop topics.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story- L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Analysis of Quotes	Comments
			Quote formula, direct quote, Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero		
			When he build a town, he named it Zahn after himself.		
	5		E Zǎǎ pèlè doó dɔ Gĩnè. 3s Zahn town one build Guinea		
			He built one town (called) Zahn in Guinea.		
	6a	Lé and/then	e nu Làibìà 3s came Liberia		I wonder if this Lé is at a higher level and should be off the story line. Notice the comma after the phrase and how it changes location. See also Sentence 8
	6b		e Zǎǎ pèlè doó dɔ 3s Zahn town one build Lesannah		
	6c		Ié a tókpó Zǎǎ-gèlèsoùlà . and 3s name Zahn-gelesonla	SOV	tókpó is two words: name put
			Then he came to Liberia. He built one Zahn town in Lesannah and he named it Zahn-gelesonia.		
	7a		E ló 3s went		
	7b		e pélè dòo dɔ Kpéì Kòlì. 3s town one build Kpei Koloi		
			He went and built one town in Kpei Koloi.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story- L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town				Analysis of Quotes	Comments
		Quote formula, direct quote, Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero						
	8a	Lé and	e 3s	ló went	zeí again	Yááá Wíí, Yaawin		This line might need to be in connectors column. See Sentence 6
	8b		a 3s	doó one	do build	yí there		
	8c		Ie 3s	a name	tókpó Zähn	Zéeyía Zeeyia		
And he again went to Yaawin. he built one there and he named it Zahn Zeeyia.								
Setting 1b	9a	Yelé Then	e 3s	yé came				
	9b		e 3s	zí back				
	9c		e 3s	nu came				
	9d		e 3s	yà settled	Zää Zahn	Kpéi Kpei	Kòlòíá Koloi	
Then he came back and he settled in Zahn Kpei Koloi.								
	10a	Lé and	e 3s	le woman	sí take	yí there		
	10b		Ié and	wà he	ye and (she)	born		
	10c		o 3p	né child	gõzè boy	yea bore	.	
And he married a woman there and they bore a son.								
	11		A 3s	tókpó name	Bèi Bie	Găň Gahn	.	Is the A Possessive or subjective. See earlier as well.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story- L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Analysis of Quotes	Comments
		Quote formula, direct quote, Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero			
		He was named or he named him Bie Gahn . (His name was....)			
Initial Event 1	12a		E fàa 3s grew		
	12b		e ke kúlá ká Zàà Kpéi Kòlòì . 3s became hero with Zahn Kpei Koloi		
		He grew. He became a hero in Zahn Kpei Koloi.			
Major Problems 1	13a	Bii à mè E ke gáàa, Because 3s body 3s became strong	Zàà mià o ló o kíelà ó zé. Zahn people 3p went 3p kill together 3p		Null reference to Bie Gahn. (The high tone o is really a contraction of o a so the “him is in there.”)
		Because he became strong. Zahn people they came together to kill (him).			
Problems Solved 1	14	Kee but	òó gbaa bëi a mó . able 3s on		
		But they were not able.			
Episode 2, Initial Event 2	15	Wa mó For this reason	ló bo géè sèlè yí kúlá dò wéè kë á zé o lèè. went *** Gio land in hero one *** be/do 3s kill 3p for		Null subject ‘(they)’ ‘Hero’ introduced as ‘hero one’.
		For this reason (they) went to Gio land to get one hero to kill him for them .			

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story- L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town						Analysis of Quotes	Comments
		Quote formula, direct quote, Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero								
Increasing Tension 2	16a	Yé o nu kúláa káa, When 3p came hero with	o ló à ká, 3p went 3s with							
	16b		wa yà à kòlò yé lé e ke à këpià léé yi, 3p set 3s palm wine that 3s be/do 3s making leaves in							
	16c		kε é à zε à bú e nua ká. *** 3s 3s kill 3s gun 3s brought with						This is the result of 16b, not a forward motion in the story line. Word order change SOV 16c 'he him kill'	
When they brought him, they went with him and they set him in the leaves from the palm wine he was making. that he kill him with the gun he brought.										
	17	Lè lè e kpèia, when day 3s broke	Bèì Gàà à lò à kòlò yoo kää . Bie Gahn 3s go 3s palm wine cut							
In the morning, Bie Gahn he started going where he cut/made his palm wine.										
	18a		A yíí sì 3s water took							
	18b		lé à gbè a vùà yia . and 3s put 3s bottle in						Tone is wrong on the a	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story- L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Analysis of Quotes	Comments
		Quote formula, direct quote, Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero			
He took the wine and he put it in his bottle.					
	19	Lè e kε kília, when 3s became thus	e yà yíli-kpàla yà à là 3s set log set 3s over mia là . drink over	lé e áà yɔ that 3s 3s wine	
When this happened (after this), he sat on the log that he can sit on to drink his wine.					
	20a		E à kòèε si 3s his cup took		
	20b		a gbɛ e bè mò 3s put 3s mouth on		
	20c		áà yɔ mi . 3s wine drank		Watch the changing shape of the pronoun here. Perhaps it is not story line but description/ identification
He took his cup, he put his mouth on it and he drank the wine.					
Major Problems 2	21a	Lé and	kúla e e bii kè tóú léé wìa, hero 3s 3s hid today palm leaves under		This may be connecting column material Or this is topic
	21b		e a búa zɔ Bèi Gáú pelà kpeï-kpeï, 3s his gun point Bie Gahn face straight		
	21c		lé a dà and 3s shot		Short-long 21c he 'e' shot/21d he 'a' shot in Bie Gahn's wine in the cup.
	21d		lè a wéé e dà Bèi Gáú a yɔ bà kɔ yia.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story- L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Analysis of Quotes	Comments
		Quote formula, direct quote, Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero			
			and 3s gunshot 3s shot Bie Gahn 3s wine in cup in		
And the hero that hid himself under the palm leaves today, he pointed the gun straight in Bie Gahn's face and he shot and his gunshot he shot in Bie Gahn's wine in the cup.					Participant: Bie Gahn's – name used instead of pronoun 'his'.
	22	Lé and	a gèe, 3s said	Direct quote, speaker only before quote	
			<<Dé è gbòò da mì yóò bà làapíea móbe? >> who 3s dirt put my wine in morning this		Rhetorical question
And he said, "Who is putting dirt in my wine this morning?"					
Problems Solved 2	23		Kúláa mé áà talè tóú lééé wì . hero body 3s trembling palm leaves under		
The hero was trembling under the palm leaves.					
	24		Tóú lééé áà zéke lè sér mò . palm leaves 3s shaking everywhere on		
The palm leaves were shaking everywhere.					
	25a		À ke zì lèé gbaa kéké, 3s making way 3s-neg never ***		Super word never 25
	25b		é bùa yílie zéé . 3s gun set again		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story- L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Analysis of Quotes	Comments
		Quote formula, direct quote, Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero			
		There was no way for him to set his gun again.			
	26	Lé and	Bèì Gàú a gèè à lèè, Bie Gahn 3s said 3s to << Gõ, wèlè í ló i pà. man get up you go you home	Direct quote, speaker, listener before quote	Longest quote
	And Bie Gahn he said to him , "Man, get up and go home.				
	27		I know that here people is 3p you take you came Bie Gahn kill		
	I know that people here brought you to kill Bie Gahn .				
	28a		Wõ wá i mò, problem not you on		
	28b		bà ló bo you go ***		
	28c		í pà . you home		
	There is no problem on you, go home.				
Closing	29ab	Lé wa ke zinaa zi seí ká When 3p be/do *** *** all with	Ié òó gbaa bèì a mò, and they-not ever able 3s on		
	29c		e wàà bū yi 3s went cave in		Elaboration-contraction 29c/d he went in cave/he went.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story- L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Analysis of Quotes	Comments
		Quote formula, direct quote, Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero			
	29d		e lo . 3s go		
When they tried all these things and they were not able (to kill him), he went in a cave.					
	30a	É ká lúó e kília móo, 3s *** day 3s thus on	òó gbaa gɛ they-notever see him		Where is "him"?
	30b		Ié e à ká pénɛea. and 3s 3s with today		
From that time, (he) has not been seen up to today.					

1. Who is in the story from the beginning of the story to the end? Bie Gahn (10-30)
2. Who is quoted directly? Bie Gahn
3. Who gives a command? Bie Gahn

Who assesses a situation in the story? [Who thinks about the situation and decides what needs to be done?] Bie Gahn

Who judges others in the story? [Who decides that someone is good or bad or decides that someone is doing the right thing or doing the wrong thing?]
4. Who solves the problem? Bie Gahn
5. Who do the people in the story respond to? [Who is the one in the story that others want to please or other people do what that person says they should?] Bie Gahn
6. With whom does the narrator empathize (identify with, understand, sympathize with, have compassion)?

[Is there anywhere in the story where the author tells how a participant feels? Does the author cause you to like one of the participants more than the others?] Bie Gahn

The one who was named most often in answer to the above questions is the 'main character'. Others who are named are Secondary Participant 1, Secondary Participant 2... Minor participants are not mentioned in answering these questions. Main character: Bie Gahn.

Secondary Participant 1 – the hero.

Zahn Town Chart B

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote, semi-direct quote, indirect quote. Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero		
Episode 1, Opening	1		Wጀ zii gጀlጀ à gbጀጀጀ lጀ Zǎǎ pጀlጀ mጀጀ . story is 3s about and Zahn town on		
This is a story about the town of Zahn.					
	2		Vጀmጀ Mጀfጀu Gጀpጀጀ lጀ a gጀea . Evangelist Matthew Gopen is 3s narrator		
Evangelist Matthew Gopen is the narrator.					
Setting 1a	3		E kጀ Gጀnጀ gጀ doጀ kጀa , o kጀ à si pià Zǎǎ. 3s were Guinea man one with 3p be/do 3s calling Zahn		
There was a Guinea man who was called Zahn.					
	4	Yé aà péε dɔɔ, when 3s town build	lጀè à tጀkጀo e dጀà mጀ Zǎǎ . then 3s name 3s self on Zahn		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote, semi-direct quote, indirect quote. Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero		
			When he build a town, he named it Zahn after himself.		
5			E Zǎǎ pèlè doó dɔ Gĩnè . 3s Zahn town one build Guinea		
			He built one town (called) Zahn in Guinea.		
6a	Lé and/then	e 3s	nu Làìbià came Liberia		I wonder if this Lé is at a higher level and should be off the story line. Notice the comma after the phrase and how it changes location. See also Sentence 8
6b		e 3s	Zǎǎ pèlè doó dɔ Lisǎñó, Zahn town one build Lesannah		
6c		íé and 3s	a tókpó Zǎǎ-gèlèsoülà name Zahn-gelesonla		
			Then he came to Liberia. He built one Zahn town in Lesannah and he named it Zahn-gelesonia.		
7a		E 3s	ló went		
7b		e	péle dòo dɔ Kpéì Kòlòjí.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote, semi-direct quote, indirect quote. Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero		
			3s town one build Kpei Koloi		
			He went and built one town in Kpei Koloi.		
	8a	Lé and	e ló zeí Yáaá Wíí, 3s went again Yaawin		This line might need to be in connectors column. See Sentence 6
	8b		a dóo dō yí 3s one build there		
	8c		Iε a tókpó Zää Zéeyía and 3s name Zahn Zeeyia		
			And he again went to Yaawin. he built one there and he named it Zahn Zeeyia.		
Setting 1b	9a		Yelé e yé Then 3s came		
	9b		e zí 3s back		
	9c		e nu 3s came		
	9d		e yà Zàà Kpèì Kòlbía 3s settled Zahn Kpei Koloi		
			Then he came back and he settled in Zahn Kpei Koloi.		
	10a		Lé e le sí yi and 3s woman take there		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote, semi-direct quote, indirect quote. Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero		
	10b		Ié wà ye and he and (she) born		
	10c		o né gɔzɛ yea 3p child boy bore		
			And he married a woman there and they bore a son.		
	11		A tókpó Béi Găū 3s name Bie Gahn		Is the A Possessive or subjective. See earlier as well.
			He was named or he named him Bie Gahn. (His name was....)		
Initial Event 1	12a		E fàa 3s grew		
	12b		e ke kúlá ká Zăă Kpéi Kólbi . 3s became hero with Zahn Kpei Koloi		
			He grew. He became a hero in Zahn Kpei Koloi.		
Major Problems 1	13a	Bii à mémé E ke gáàa, Because 3s body 3s became strong	Zăă mìà o ló o kíelà ó zε. Zahn people 3p went 3p together 3p kill		
			Because he became strong. Zahn people came together to kill (him).		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town					Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote, semi-direct quote, indirect quote. Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero						
Problems Solved 1	14		Kεε óó gbaa bèi a mò . but they-notever able 3s on						
But they were not able.									
Episode 2, Initial Event 2	15	Wa móò For this reason	ló bo géé sèlè yí kúlá dò wéé ke á ze o lèé. went *** Gio land in hero one *** be/do 3s kill 3p for						
For this reason (they) went to Gio land to get a hero to kill him for them.									
Increasing Tension 2	16a	Yé o nu kúláá káá, When 3p came hero with	o ló à ká, 3p went 3s with						
	16b		wa yà à kòlò yó lé e ke à kepiàa léé yi, set 3s palm wine that 3s be/do 3s making leaves in						

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town						Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
		Quote formula, direct quote, semi-direct quote, indirect quote. Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero								
	16c		kε é à zε à bú e nua ká. *** 3s kill 3s gun 3s brought with						This is the result of 16b, not a forward motion in the story line.	
	When they brought him , they went with him and they set him in the leaves from the palm wine he was making. that he kill him with the gun he brought.									
	17	Lè lè e kpéia, when day 3s broke	Bèì Gàâ áà lò à kòlò yɔɔ káä . Bie Gahn 3s go 3s palm wine cut							
	In the morning, Bie Gahn he started going where he cut/made his palm wine.									
	18a		A yíí si 3s water took							
	18b		lé à gbɛ a vùàa yia . and 3s put 3s bottle in							
	He took the wine and put it in his bottle.									
	19	Lè e kε kília, when 3s became thus	e yà yíli-kpàla lè e yà à là áà yɔ							

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote, semi-direct quote, indirect quote. Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero		
			3s set log that 3s set 3s over 3s wine mia là . drink over		
When this happened (after this), he sat on the log that he can sit on to drink his wine.					
	20a		E à kòèè si 3s his cup took		SOV
	20b		a gbɛ e bè mò 3s put 3s mouth on		SVO SOV
	20c		áà yó mi . 3s wine drank		Watch the changing shape of the pronoun here. Perhaps it is not story line but description/identification
He took his cup, he put his mouth on it and he drank the wine.					
Major Problems 2	21a		Lé kúla e e bii kè tóú lée wìa, and hero 3s 3s hid today palm leaves under		This may be connecting column material Or this is topic
	21b		e a búa zò Béi 3s Gàáù pelà kpeí-kpeí, his gun point Bie Gahn face straight		SOVPlace
	21c		lé a dà and 3s shot		SV

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote, semi-direct quote, indirect quote. Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero		
	21d		<p>lè a wélé e dà Bèi Gàú a yóo bà kòò yia. and 3s gunshot 3s shot Bie Gahn 3s wine in cup in</p> <p>And the hero that hid himself under the palm leaves today, he pointed the gun straight in Bie Gahn's face and he shot and his gunshot he shot in Bie Gahn's wine in the cup.</p>		OSVPlace
	22	Lé and	<p>a gèe, 3s said</p> <p><<Dé è gbò da mì yóo bà làapiéa moibe? >> who 3s dirt put my wine in morning this</p> <p>And he said, "Who is putting dirt in my wine this morning?"</p>		Direct quote
Problems Solved 2	23		<p>Kúláá mé áà talè tóú lééé wì . hero body 3s trembling palm leaves under</p> <p>The hero was trembling under the palm leaves.</p>		SVPlace
	24		Tóú lééé áà zɔ́kε lè sér mò .		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town				Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote, semi-direct quote, indirect quote. Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero					
			palm leaves 3s shaking everywhere on					
			The palm leaves were shaking everywhere.					
	25a		À kε zì lèé gbaa kébé, 3s making way 3s-neg never ***				Super word never 25	
	25b		é bùa yílie zeí . 3s gun set again				SOV	
			There was no way for him to set his gun again.					
	26a 26bc	Lé and	Bèì Găú a gèe à lèé, Bie Gahn 3s said 3s to << Gõ, wèlè í ló i pà. man get up you go you home		Direct quote, speaker, listener before quote	SVIO	Longest quote VS,VSPlace	
			And Bie Gahn said to him, "Man, get up and go home."					
	27		I know that here people is 3p you take you came Bie Gahn kill				Burger structure 26c "...go home/28bc...you go you home"	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote, semi-direct quote, indirect quote. Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero		
			I know that people here brought you to kill Bie Gahn.		
	28a		Wō wá i mò, problem not you on		THEME OF STORY: "Bie Gahn said to him, 'Man, get up and go home. I know that people brought you here to kill Bie Gahn. There is no problem on you, go home.' ...they tried all these things and they were not able (to kill him)."
	28b		bà ló bo you go ***		
	28c		í pà . you home		
			There is no problem on you, go home.		
Closing	29ab	lē wa ke zinaa zi seí ká When 3p be/do **** all with	lē òó gbaa bëi a mò, and they-not ever able 3s on		
	29c		e wàà bū yi 3s went cave in		Elaboration-contraction 29c/d he went in cave/he went.
	29d		e lo . 3s go		
			When they tried all these things and they were not able (to kill him), he went in a cave.		
	30a	É ká lúó e kília mòo, 3s *** day 3s thus on	òó gbaa gɛ they-notever see him		Where is "him"? SVO

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story - L2 analysis pre-workshop Zahn Town	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
			Quote formula, direct quote, semi-direct quote, indirect quote. Zahn, Bie Gahn Zahn people, hero		
	30b		Ié e à ká pénèea. and 3s 3s with today		
From that time, he has not been seen up to today.					

Bush Confusion Chart A

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion	Analysis of quotes, Word order	Analysis PR-Participant Reference
			Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote		
Title	1		W̄-zii ḡawū : Luu mó̄ wéé lé e ke Zuápà wà Dòùmpào fìà story title bush *** confusion that it was Zuopa and Doumpa them between		
Bush confusion that was between Zuapa and Doumpa.					
Setting 1a	2a		Mí e w̄-zii e kea ḡeé SVO m l̄eé l̄é e Z̄éé M̄éé káa.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion							Analysis of quotes, Word order	Analysis PR-Participant Reference
			Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote								
			person he story 3s this said 1s *** is he John Mehn								
The person who told me the story is John Mehn.											
	3a		Luu bush	wéé Zuápà gà Bàágèlè Làìbíà. confusion that Zuopa and betweenfeet Edwin Barclay Liberia	lé wà e Dòùmpào gbè liésí ká it Doumpa them 3s put head with	e ké fíàa ké éwí ká was them *** head with	SVTime		PR Zuapa and Doumpa are not introduced, first mentioned <u>after</u> verb.		
The bush confusion between Zuapa and Doumpa started when Edwin Barclay was head of Liberia.											
Initial Event	4		Géè-mìà wà Zuápà wà o à dìè sí Dòùmpà-mìà Gio people they towns around great people over	líésínì pélée nì mèépíéa o gbùò e la. and from PL from is/was them self passed Doumpa	lé ò o diea PL and they them passed	go lé o diea that it take	SVO?				
Gio people's leaders from Zuapa and surrounding towns, took themselves to be greater than Doumpa people.											

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion	Analysis of quotes, Word order	Analysis PR-Participant Reference
		Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote			
5ab			Géè-mìà lé o Zuápà o máà-mìà lé o Dòùmpàwà luu dò si lé o yà à yía. Gio people that they Zuapa they Mano people that they Doumpa their bush some took and they set it in	SOV, SVPlace	Vivid language 5 took some bush from Mano people...sat on it. 6 problem made Zuapa people angry
Those Gio people that are from Zuapa, they took some bush from the Mano people that are in Doumpa and they sat in it.					
6ab	Lè lε Dòùmpà-mìà o wèea, When that Doumpa people they talked	w᷑ e Business 3s	Zuápà-mìà wàa. Zuapa people anger	TimeSOV	
When the Doumpa people they talked, problem made Zuapa people angry.					
Major Problems	7a		Zuápà-mìà o gèlè yà Dòùmpà-mìà mò. Zuapa people they fight set Doumpa people on	SVO	PEAK 7-17 Parallelism, Generic-specific 7/8
Zuapa people they attacked the Doumpa people.					

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion	Analysis of quotes, Word order	Analysis PR-Participant Reference
		Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote			
	8ab		Géè-mìà lé ò go Dóò-pèlè ní yía o gèlè yà Máà pèlè vù dóo mò. Gio people that they from Doe town PL in they fight set Mano town ten one on	SVO	Vivid language 7,8 attacked 9 burned their villages
Gio people that are from Doe towns they attacked ten Mano towns.					
	9a		Lé o wà kpää ni géléa. and they their village PL burned.	SOV	
and they burned their villages.					
(Setting 1b)	10a		Vñlε lé è go Zuápà lè e kε Géè-mìà Líesipìà gélèa píea. Vonleh that he from Zuapa he was Gio people leader attack during	SV-Predicate Noun-Time	Gio people's leader (not ' <u>their</u> leader')
Vonleh from Zuapa was the Gio people's leader during the attack.					
	11ab		o gጀ ò si Súò lé è go Dòùmpàa kú lé o o dùò bíkèi Gbìa pεleìa. they man they call Suo that he from Doumpa held and they them put jail Gbia town.	SOV,SOVPlace	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion						Analysis of quotes, Word order	Analysis PR-Participant Reference
			Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote							
They arrested a man from Doumpa called Suo and they put them[sic] in jail in Gbia town.										
	12a		O goà dò kú kíli, 3p men some held also lé o o dùò bíkèia. and they them put jail		SOV		Parallelism 11/12. Long-short 11b/12b they put them in jail in Gbia town/they put them in jail.			
	12b				SOVPlace					
They some men arrested also and they put them in jail.										
	13a		O yébo gaa nɔ o lèε. they work hard give them to		SOVlo		Vivid language 11,12 arrested, put in jail 13 hard work			
They gave them hard work.										
Problems Solved	14abc	Lè Tómè e gbɛ óà Liésì Làíbìà káa, When Tubman he put *** lead Liberia with	e dɔmìa wò súo kε lè e kíé-gɛ kε o ká. he chiefs called *** and 3s met *** them with				Tubman is not introduced, first mentioned before verb.			
When Tubman he started leading Liberia, he called the chiefs and met with them.										
	15		Kε ó luu wò gbɛ e kíé léa. so that they bush problem it settle ***							
So that they began to settle the bush problem.										
	16a		Tómè a gèe ó mia o ke bíkèia bɔ pεlei.		Indirect quote	Parallelism 16/17 ...they persons they was (in) jail put out/they Suo				15a

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion						Analysis of quotes, Word order	Analysis PR-Participant Reference
			Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote							
			Tubman he said they persons they were (in) jail put out also							and Men the they were (in) jail put out also
Tubman he said they were to release the people in jail.										
	17a		O Súó wà goà lé o kε bíkèia bɔ pεlei kíli. they Suo and men that they was jail put out also							
They released Suo and the men that were in jail.										
Closing	18ab		Tóbò, Dóò, wà Télà ni zì lúó káa, Zuápà wà wò Dòùmpà-mìà wà luu e wèlè nò kíli lé ò ó gbaa bëi à yí bëia. Tolbert Doe and Taylor PL their? time during Zuopa and Doumpa people their bush business it get up just also and they they never able it settle?						Super word 18 never able to settle it Parallelism 15/18b/19b/ 20b they began to settle the bush problem/ they were never able to settle it/they began? to settle it/ they thus settled the bush problem	
During Tolbert, Doe, and Taylor's time, Zuopa and Doumpa's bush problem started again and they were never able to settle it.										
	19ab	Kεε Lié-sí-mi Sèlî zì lúó káa, but President Sirleaf her	Iuu wéé lé e kε Zuápà wà Dòùmpào fiàá o à gbae e kíé lé.						President Sirleaf is not introduced, brought into the sentence before the verb.	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion						Analysis of quotes, Word order	Analysis PR-Participant Reference
		Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote								
		day during	bush confusion Zuopa and between they settle ***	that it Doumpa they it put it						
But during President Sirleaf's time, the bush confusion between Zuopa and Doumpa , they began? to settle it.										
	20a		Sèlî mìà pèèl-e-zé mò Sirleaf she town from they	íésí lé yía mò head people towns settle	vò ò go yà o	wà pééé kíé	pεlei		Parallelism 20a/20b Sirleaf she head town people... they settle on/they bush problem it thus in settle	
	20b		Ié yì and they in	luu bèia. bush	wò problem	e it	kília			
Sirleaf and the townspeople that were from the two towns, they settled and they the bush business it thus settled.										
	21 ab	Kèè doo áà year	vúdóo lé diea ten one that it has passed	Zuápà kíe Zuopa	wà and Doumpa they each other	Dòùmpào bèleyapià. respect	gbaa now	o they	TimeS TimeSOV	Burger structure 4/21 Gio People's leaders from Zuapa...took them selves to be greater than Doumpa people/Zuopa & Doumpa now respect each other.
Some 10 years have passed (and) Zuopa and Doumpa now respect each other.										

1. Who is in the story from the beginning of the story to the end? Quopa and Doumpa people
2. Who is quoted directly? ---
3. Who gives a command? Tubman 16a
4. Who thinks about a situation and decides what needs to be done? Gio people from Zuapa, Tubman 14
5. Who judges others in the story? [Who decides that someone is good or bad or decides that someone is doing the right thing or doing the wrong thing?] Gio (Quopa) people
6. Who solves the problem? Tubman 14, Sirleaf 20
7. Who do the people in the story respond to? [Who is the one in the story that others want to please or other people do what that person says they should?] Tubman 16,17, Sirleaf 19,20
8. With whom does the narrator empathize (identify with, understand, sympathize with, have compassion)? Mano people in Doumpa
[Is there anywhere in the story where the author tells how a participant feels? Does the author cause you to like one of the participants more than the others?]

The one who was named most often in answer to the above questions is the main character. Tubman (4) Others who are named are Secondary Participant 1 – Gio people from Zuapa (3) Secondary Participant 2 – Sirleaf (2), Secondary Participant 3 – Mano people from Doumpa (2)... Minor participants are usually not mentioned in answering these questions.

Bush Confusion Chart B

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
		Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote			
Title	1		Wó-zii gáwú : Luu móò wéé lé e ke Zuápà wà Dòùmpào fià story title bush *** confusion that it was Zuopa and Doumpa them between		
Bush confusion that was between Zuapa and Doumpa .					
Setting 1a	2a		Mí e wó-zii e kea gée No marker m lεe lε e Zɔɔ Méí káa. person he story 3s this said 1s *** is he John Mehn		B-beginning of story
The person who told me the story is John Mehn.					
	3a		Luu wéé lé e ke Zuápà wà Dòùmpào fià gá e gbé ke Éwí Bàágèlè lε líésí ká Làibíà. bush confusion that it was Zuopa and Doumpa them betweenfeet 3s put *** Edwin Barclay was head with Liberia	No marker	
		The bush confusion between Zuapa and Doumpa started when Edwin Barclay was head of Liberia.			

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
		Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote			
Initial Event	4		<p>Géè-mìà wà líésínì lé ò go Zuápàa wà péléé nì lé o à měípiéa o o diè sí gbùò e diea Dòùmpà-mìà la.</p> <p>Gio people and leader PL that they from Zuapa and towns PL is/was they it around they them self take great 3s passed Doumpa people over</p>	No marker	B-Change of participants, beginning of Initial Event section.
<p>Gio people's leaders from Zuapa and surrounding towns, took themselves to be greater than Doumpa people.</p>					
	5ab		<p>Géè-mìà lé o Zuápàa o máà-mìà lé o Dòùmpàwà luu dò si lé o yà à yía.</p> <p>Gio people that they Zuapa they Mano people that they Doumpa their bush some took and they set it in</p>	No marker	Vivid language 5 took some bush from Mano people...sat on it. 6 problem made Zuapa people angry
		<p>Those Gio people that are from Zuapa, they took some bush from the Mano people that are in Doumpa and they sat in it.</p>			
	6ab	<p>lè ie Dòùmpà-mìà o wèea, When that Doumpa people they talked</p>	<p>wó e Zuápà-mìà wàa. Business 3s Zuapa people anger</p>	Time marker	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
		Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote			
		When the Doumpa people they talked, problem made Zuapa people angry.			
Major Problems	7a		Zuápà-mìà o gèlè yà Dòùmpà-mìà mò. Zuapa people they fight set Doumpa people on	No marker	PEAK 7-17 B-Change of time, place. Beginning of Major Prob.
		Zuapa people they attacked the Doumpa people .			
	8ab		Géè-mìà lé ò go Dóò-pèlè nì yía o gèlè yà Máà pèlè vù dóo mò. Gio people that they from Doe town PL in they fight set Mano town ten one on	No marker	Parallelism, Generic-specific 7/8 Vivid language 7,8 attacked 9 burned their villages
		Gio people that are from Doe towns they attacked ten Mano towns.			
	9a		Lé o wà kpää ni géléa. and they their village PL burned.	No marker	
		and they burned their villages.			
(Setting 1b)	10a		Võlè lé è go Zuápà lè e kε Géè-mìà Líésipà gélèa píea. Vonleh that he from Zuapa he was Gio people leader attack during	No marker	Gio people's leader (not ' <u>their</u> leader')
		Vonleh from Zuapa was the Gio people's leader during the attack.			
	11ab		O gጀ ò si Súò lé è go Dòùmpàa kú lé o o dùò bíkèì Gbà pélèia.	No marker	B-Change of participants, theme.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
		Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote			
			they man they call Suo that he from Doumpa held and they them put jail Gbia town.		
		They arrested a man from Doumpa called Suo and they put them[sic] in jail in Gbia town.			
	12a		O góà dò kú kíli, 3p men some held also lé o o dùò bíkèia. and they them put jail	No marker	Parallelism 11/12. Long-short 11b/12b they put them in jail in Gbia town/they put them in jail.
	12b				
	13a		O yébo gaa nɔ o lèe. they work hard give them to	No marker	Vivid language 11,12 arrested, put in jail 13 hard work
		They gave them hard work.			
Problems Solved	14abc	Lè Tómè e e gbé óà Liésì Làíbíà he káa, When Tubman he put *** lead Liberia with	dómia vò sóu kε lè e kíé-gé kε o ká. chiefs called *** and 3s met *** them with	Time marker	B-Change of time, place, participants
		When Tubman he started leading Liberia, he called the chiefs and met with them.			
	15		Kε ó luu wò gbé e kié léa. so that they bush problem it settle ***	No marker	
		So that they began to settle the bush problem.			

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion						Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
		Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote								
	16a		Tómè a gèè ó mia o ke bíkèia bɔ pεlei. Tubman he said they persons they was jail put out						No marker	Parallelism 16/17 ...they persons they was (in) jail put out/they Suo and Men the they were (in) jail put out also
	17a		O Súó wà gɔà lé o ke bíkèia bɔ pεlei kíli. they Suo and men that they was jail put out also						No marker	
		They released Suo and the men that were in jail.								
Closing	18ab	Tóbò, Dóò, wà Télà ni zì lúó káa, Tolbert Doe and TaylorPL their? Time during	Zuápà wà Dòùmpà-mìà wà luu wɔ e wèlè nò kíli lé ò ó gbaa bèi à yí bèia. Zuopa and Doumpa people their bush business it get up just also and they they never able it settle?						Time marker	B-Change of time, participants Super word 18 <u>never</u> able to settle it Parallelism 15/18b/19b/ 20b they began to settle the bush problem/ they were never able to settle it/they began? to settle it/ they thus settled the bush problem
		During Tolbert, Doe, and Taylor's time, Zuopa and Doumpa's bush problem started again and they were never able to settle it.								
	19ab	Kεε Líé-sí-mi Sèlî zì lúó káa, but President Sirleaf her day during	Iuu wéé lé e ke Zuápà wà Dòùmpào fiàá o à gbè e kíé lé.	Zuopa and Doumpa they					Connecting word Kεε 'but', time marker	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis pre-workshop Bush Confusion	Type of Boundary Marker, Connector	Analysis
		Tubman, Gio (Zuapa) people, Sirleaf, Doumpa people. Quote formula, indirect quote			
		between they it put it settle ***			
		But during President Sirleaf's time, the bush confusion between Zuapa and Doumpa , they began? to settle it.			
20a		Sèlîí e líésí wò wà pèlei mìà lé ò go pélée pèlè-zé yía yà o kíé mò Sirleaf she head and town people that they from towns two in set they settle on	No marker	Parallelism 20a/20b Sirleaf she head town people... they settle on/they bush problem it thus in settle	
20b		lé o luu wò e kília yì bìa. and they bush problem it thus in settle?			
		Sirleaf and the townspeople that were from the two towns, they settled and they the bush business it thus settled.			
21 ab		Kèè vùdóo wéé dóo lé áà diea year ten one that it has passed	Zuápà wà Dòúmpào gbaa o kíe bélèyapià. Zuopa and they Doumpa they now respect each other	Story ends with summary statement, part of burger structure 4/21	Burger structure 4/21 Gio People's leaders from Zuapa...took them selves to be greater than Doumpa people/Zuopa & Doumpa now respect each other.
Some 10 years have passed (and) Zuopa and Doumpa now respect each other.					

Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers in a Natural Story and a Bible story (This table is part of the chart analysis.)

	L2 "Bush Confusion" Story	Mark 5:1-20
No marker	2,7,11 = 3	
Connecting word		
Time word		
Time marker	14,18 = 2	
Location marker		
Tail-head connection		
Marker that points back		
Burger structure	4/11 = 2	
Ending boundary – Summary statement	11	

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within Paragraphs in a Natural Story and a Bible story

	L2 "Bush Confusion" Story	"Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits" Mark 5:1-20
No Marker	3,5,8,9,10,12,13,15,16,17,20 = 11	
Connecting word	Kεε 'but' 19 = 1	
Time word		
Time marker	6 = 1	
Tail-head connection		
Ending boundary – Summary statement	21 = 1	

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: Almost all (11 out of 14) of the sentences within a paragraph begin with no marker.

Bush Confusion Chart for Analysis

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 for analysis by team Bush Confusion									Type of Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	1		W᠁-ziι g᠁wū : Luu mój wéé l᠁ e k᠁ ^ε Zuápà wà Dòǔmpào f᠁ ^{la} story title bush *** confusion that it was Zuopa and Doumpa them between										
Bush confusion that was between Zuapa and Doumpa.													
	2a		Mí e w᠁-ziι e kea g᠁e m l᠁e l᠁ ^ε e Z᠁ ^ɔ M᠁ ^ɛ k᠁á. person he story 3s this said 1s *** is he John Mehn										
The person who told me the story is John Mehn.													
	3a		Luu wéé l᠁ e k᠁ Zuápà wà Dòǔmpào f᠁ ^{la} g᠁ e g᠁ ^b ^ɛ ke éw᠁ Baágèlè l᠁ ^ε líésí k᠁ L᠁ibíá. bush confusion that it was Zuopa and Doumpa them betweenfeet 3s put *** Edwin Barclay was head with Liberia										
The bush confusion between Uopa and Doumpa started when Edwin Barclay was head of Liberia.													
	4		Géé-mìà wà líésínì l᠁ ò go Zuápàa wà pééé nì l᠁ o à m᠁ípíea o o diè sí gbùò e diea Dòǔmpà-mìà la. Gio people and leader PL that they from Zuapa and towns PL is/was they it around they them self take great 3s passed Doumpa people over										

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 for analysis by team Bush Confusion	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Analysis		
			Gio people's leaders from Zuapa and surrounding towns, took themselves to be greater than Doumpa people.				
	5ab		Géè-mià lé o Zuápà o máà-mià lé o Dòùmpàwà luu dò si lé o yà à yía. Gio people that they Zuapa they Mano people that they Doumpa their bush some took and they set it in				
			Those Gio people that are from Zuapa, they took some bush from the Mano people that are in Doumpa and they sat in it.				
	6ab	Lè lε mià o When that people they Dòùmpà- wèea, Doumpa talked	wő e Zuápà-mià wàa. Business 3s Zuapa people anger				
			When the Doumpa people talked, problem made Zuapa people angry.				
	7a		Zuápà-mià o gèlè yà Dòùmpà-mià mò. Zuapa people they fight set Doumpa people on				
			Zuapa people attacked the Doumpa people.				
	8ab		Géè-mià lé ò go Dóò-pèlè nì yía o gèlè yà Máà pèlè vù dóo mò. Gio people that they from Doe town PL in they fight set Mano town ten one on				
			Gio people that are from Doe towns attacked ten Mano towns.				
	9a		Lé o wà kpää ni géléa. and they their village PL burned.				
			and they burned their villages.				

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 for analysis by team Bush Confusion	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	10a		võlε lé è go Zuápà lè e kε Géè-mìà Líésipà gélèa píea. Vonleh that he from Zuapa he was Gio people leader attack during		Vonleh from Zuapa was the Gio people's leader during the attack.
	11ab		O gō ò si Súò lé è go Dòùmpàa kú lé o o dùò bíkèì Gbìa pεleia. they man they call Suo that he from Doumpa held and they them put jail Gbìa town.		
	12a		O gōà dò kú kíli, 3p men some held also		
	12b		lé o o dùò bíkèia. and they them put jail		
	13a		O yεbo gaa nɔ o lèε. they work hard give them to		
			They gave them hard work.		
	14abc	Lè Tómè e gbè óà Líésì Láíbìà káa, When Tubman he put ***	e dɔmìa vò súo kε lé e kíé-gè kε o ká. called *** and 3s met ***		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 for analysis by team Bush Confusion	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
		lead Liberia with			
			When Tubman started leading Liberia, he called the chiefs and met with them.		
	15		Kε ó luu wò gbɛ e kíé léa. so that they bush problem it settle ***		
			So that they began to settle the bush problem. (is problem spelled wrong?)		
	16a		Tómè a gèe ó mia o ke bíkèia bɔ pɛlei. Tubman he said they persons they was jail put out		
			Tubman said they were to release the people in jail .		
	17a		O Súó wà gɔà íé o ke bíkèia bɔ pɛlei kíli. they Suo and men that they was jail put out also		
			They released Suo and the men that were in jail.		
	18ab		Tóbò, Dóò, wà Télà ni zì lúó káa, Zuápà wà Dòùmpà-mìà wà lúo wɔ̄ e wèlè nò kíli íé ò ó gbaa bɛi à yí bɛia. Tolbert Doe and Taylor PL their? time during Zuopa and Doumpa people their bush business it get up just also and they they never able able it settle?		
			During Tolbert, Doe, and Taylor's time, Zuopa and Doumpa's bush problem started again and they were never able to settle it.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 for analysis by team Bush Confusion										Type of Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	19ab	Kεε Líé-sí-mi Sèlîi lúó káa, but President Sirleaf her day during	zì luu wéé lé e kε Zuápà wà Dòúmpào fiàá o à gbè e kíé lé. bush confusion that it was Zuopa and Doumpa they betweenthey it put it settle ***											
But during President Sirleaf's time, the bush confusion between Zuopa and Doumpa, they began? to settle it.														
	20a		Sèlîi e líésí vò wà pεlei mìà lé ò go pélée pèlē-zε yía yà o kíé mò Sirleaf she head and town people that they from towns two in set they settle on											
	20b		lé o luu wò e kília yì bèia. and they bush problem it thus in settle?											
Sirleaf and the townspeople that were from the two towns, they settled and they the bush business it thus settled.														
	21 ab	Kèè vùdoo wéé doo lé áà year diea ten one that it has passed	Zuápà wà Dòúmpào gbaa o kíe béləyapià. Zuopa and Doumpa they now they each other respect											
Some 10 years have passed (and) Zuopa and Doumpa now respect each other.														

Bush Confusion Chart A by Translator 2A

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
Title	1		<p>Wá-zili gáwú : Luu móo wéé lé e ke Zuápà wà Dóúmpà o fíà story title bush *** confusion that it was Zuopa and Doumpa them between</p> <p>Bush confusion that was between Zuapa and Doumpa.</p>		This is a from because it started in a place, people
Opening	2a		<p>Mi e wá-zili e kee gée m lee ís e z35 Mié káa. person he story 3s this said is *** is he John Mehn</p> <p>The person who told me the story is John Mehn.</p>		took part in it and also the time that it
Setting	3a		<p>Luu wéé lí e ke Zuápà wà Dóúmpà or fíà gá e gbé ke éwí Bágèlè lí líésí ká Láibià. bush confusion that it was Zuopa and Doumpa them between feet 3s put *** Edwin Barclay was head with Liberia</p> <p>The bush confusion between Zuopa and Doumpa started when Edwin Barclay was head of Liberia.</p>		took place & people are still in those time today
Setting	4	✓	<p>Géé-mià wà líésini lí ò go Zuápà ✗ SOV wà pélee ni lí o a méipíea o dié sí ✓ gbùò e diea Dóúmpà-mià la. Gio people and leader PL that they from Zuapa and towns PL is/was they it around they them self take great 3s passed Doumpa people over</p> <p>Gio people's leaders from Zuapa and surrounding towns, took themselves to be greater than Doumpa people.</p>		Bunger Structure 4
Initial Event	Sab		<p>Géé-mià lí o Zuápà o mià-mià lí o Dóúmpà wà luu dò si lí o yà à yia.</p>		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
			Gio people that they Zuapa they Mano people that they Doumpa their bush some took and they set it in s .	SOV	
			Those Gio people that are from Zuapa, they took some bush from the Mano people that are in Doumpa and they sat in it.		
Developing Conflict	6ab	Lé ie Dòumpà-mià o wèea,	wé è Zuápà-mià waa. Business 3s Zuapa people anger	SOV	before the Peak-Connector
		When that Doumpa people they talked	When the Doumpa people talked, problem made Zuapa people angry.		
Increasing Tension	7a		Zuápà-mià o gèlè yà Dòumpà-mià mò. Zuapa people they fight set Doumpa people on	SOV	
			Zuapa people attacked the Doumpa people.		
Increasing Tension	8ab		Gio-mià s lé b go Dòb-péè ní yá. Gio people that they from Doe town PL in they fight set Mano town ten one on	SOV	repeated action 7 & 8
			Gio people that are from Doe towns attacked ten Mano towns.		
Major Problem	9a		Lé so wà kpää nl géléa. and they their village PL burned.	SOV	PK-9-17 vivid language
			and they burned their villages.		
Setting	10a		Vôle lé è go Zuápà lè e ké Gée- mià Léépià gèlèa piéa. Vonleh that he from Zuapa he was Gio people leader attack during		attacked (7&8) burned (9)
			Vonleh from Zuapa was the Gio people's leader during the attack.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
developing conflict	11a b		<p>gò ò si Sùò lé è go Doumpaa kúw lé o o duò békèl Gbia peleia. they man they call Suo that he from Doumpa held and they them put jail Gbia town.</p>	SOV	Vivid language Arrested put in Jail 11a, 12
They arrested a man from Doumpa called Suo and they put them[sic] in jail in Gbia town.					
increasing tension	12a		<p>gò dò kú kill, 3p men some held also</p>	SOV	Repeated action 11a, 12
	12b		<p>lé o o duò békèia. and they them put jail</p>		
increasing tension	13a		<p>yébo gaa nò o lée. they work hard give them to</p>	SOV	
They gave them hard work.					
Problem solved	14a bc	<p>Lè Tóme e gbé óà Liésì Lèbìà káa, When Tubman he put *** lead Liberia with</p>	<p>e dómia wò suò ke o ká. he chiefs called *** and 3s met *** them with</p>	SOV	Connector in the Peak
When Tubman started leading Liberia, he called the chiefs and met with them.					
Problem solved	15		<p>Ke óò luu wò gbé e kié léa. so that they bush problem it settle ***</p>	SOV	
So that they began to settle the bush problem. (is problem spelled wrong?)					
	16a		<p>Tóme a gée ó mia o ke békèia bo pelei.</p>	SOV	Indirect quote Speaker said

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
Problem Solving			Tubman put he said they person they was jail		
Problem Solving	17a		Tubman said they were to release the people in jail. O sgg wá gá lé o ka bñkela bñ pele kill. they Sud and men that they was jail put out also	repeated action SOV	repeated action 16 8 17
Closing	18a b		They released Sud and the men that were in jail. Tiboo, Doe, wá Telá ni zí luó káa. Zuapa wá Dóumpa-má wá luó wá e wala ná kill lí ó á gbaa bai á yí bela. Tolbert Doe and Taylor PL their? time during Zuapa and Doumpa people their bush business it get up just also and they they never able it settle?		
			During Tolbert, Doe, and Taylor's time, Zuapa and Doumpa's bush problem started again and they were never able to settle it.		
Closing	19a b	Kaz Lié-sí-mi S Selii	luu weé lí e ka Zuápa wá Dóumpa zí luó káa, o fñáa o á gbaé e kíé lí. but President Sirleaf her day bush confusion that it was Zuapa and during Doumpa they between they it put	Contrast 18 8 19	Connector after the Peak
			But during President Sirleaf's time, the bush confusion between Zuapa and Doumpa, they began? to settle it.		
Closing	20a	Selii	e llési vó wá pelei miá lí ó go péleé pélle-za yía yá o kíé má Sirleaf she head and town people that they from towns two in set they settle on		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Analysis of quotes	Analysis
Glossing	20b		lé so luu wò e killa yì bélia. and they bush problem it thus in ✓ settle?	SOV	Parallelism 20a & b
			Sirleaf and the townspeople that were from the two towns, they settled and they the bush business it thus settled.		
Finish	21 ab	Kèè year lé ten that it has passed	vùdáo wéle dóo áà diea one Zuápà wà Dòúmpà bélèyapìà. Zuopa and Doumpa respect	gbaa o kíe they now they each other Some 10 years have passed (and) Zuopa and Doumpa now respect each other.	T SOV

1. Who is in the story from beginning to end? The people of Zuapa and the people of Doumpa.
2. Who is quoted directly?
3. Who gives a command? Tubman
4. Who thinks about a situation and decides what needs to be done? Tubman and Gio people
5. Who judges others in the story? [Who decides that someone is good or bad or decides that someone is doing the right thing or doing the wrong thing?]
6. Who solves the problem? Sirleaf and Tubman
7. Who do the people in the story respond to? [Who is the one in the story that others want to please or other people do what that person says they should?] Sirleaf and Tubman
8. With whom does the narrator empathize (identify with, understand, sympathize with, have compassion)? The narrator empathize on Jah. [Is there anywhere in the story where the author tells how a participant feels? Does the author cause you to like one of the participants more than the others?]

The one who was named most often in answer to the above questions is the 'main character. Others who are named are Secondary Participant 1, Secondary Participant 2... Minor participants are usually not mentioned in answering these questions.

Main character: Tubman Secondary: Sirleaf

Secondary 2: Zuapa -- the Gio people, Doumpa -- the Mano people Noun 9 (The questions lead to this conclusion, but the story is about the Gio and Mano and that is who Translator 2A color codes in the text.)

Bush Confusion Chart B by Translator 2A

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	1		Wé-zii gáwü : Luu móó wéé lé e ke Zuápà wà Dòúmpà o fià story title bush *** confusion that it was Zuopa and Doumpa them between		
Bush confusion that was between Zuapa and Doumpa.					
	2a		Mí e wé-zii e kea gée m lee lé e Zéé Mél káá. person he story 3s this said 1s *** is he John Mehn		
The person who told me the story is John Mehn.					
	3a		Luu wéé lé e ke Zuápà wà Dòúmpà o fià gá e gbe ke éwí Bàágèlè le líésí ká Láibìà. bush confusion that it was Zuopa and Doumpa them between feet 3s put *** Edwin Barclay was head with Liberia	P/B <i>No marker</i>	
The bush confusion between Uopa and Doumpa started when Edwin Barclay was head of Liberia.					
	4		Géz-mià wà líésí lé ó go Zuápà wà pélee ní lé o à méípléa o o dié sí gbùa e deea Dòúmpà-mià la. Gio people and leader PL that they from Zuapa and towns PL is/was they it around they them self take great 3s passed Doumpa people over	<i>No marker</i> <i>Burger Structure</i> <i>SOV</i>	
Gio people's leaders from Zuapa and surrounding towns, took themselves to be greater than Doumpa people.					
	Sab		Géz-mià lé o Zuápà o móó-mià lé o Dòúmpà wà luu dà si lé o yá à yá.	<i>No marker</i>	P/B change of place

Pattern of the story	No. Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
		Gio people that they Zuapa they Mano people that they Doumpa their bush some took and they set it in	Marker	Marker or Marker
		Those Gio people that are from Zuapa, they took some bush from the Mano people that are in Doumpa and they sat in it.		
6ab	Lé ie Dóumpà- mià o wèea, When that people they talked	wò e Zuápà-mià wà. Business 3s Zuapa people anger	Time marker	
		When the Doumpa people talked, problem made Zuapa people angry.		
7a		Zuápà-mià o gèlè yà Dóumpà-mià mó. Zuapa people they fight set Doumpa peopleon	O gèlè yà NO Marker	
		Zuapa people attacked the Doumpa people.		
8ab		Géè-mià lé ò go Dóò-pélè nì yá o gèlè yà Máà pélè vú dóo mó. Gio people that they from Doe town PL in one on	O gèlè yà NO Marker	
		Gio people that are from Doe towns attacked ten Mano towns.		
9a		Lé o wà kpää ni gélée. and they their village PL burned.	gélée NO Marker	
		and they burned their villages.		
10a		Vòlé lé è go Zuápà lì e ke Géè- mià Líésipà gélée pléa. Vonleh that he from Zuapa he was Gio people leader attack during	NO Marker	/
		The Vonleh was the Gio people's leader during the attack.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	11a b		O gɔ́ ò si Suò lè è go Dòúmpàa kū lè o o dùò bíkéi Gbia peleia. they man they call Suo that he from Doumpa held and they them put jail Gbia town.	No Marker	
They arrested a man from Doumpa called Suo and they put them[sic] in jail in Gbia town.					
	12a		O gpà dò kù kill, 3p men some held also	No Marker	
	12b		lè o o dùò bíkéia. and they them put jail		
	13a		O yebo gaa nɔ o lè. they work hard give them to	No Marker	
They gave them hard work.					
	14a bc	Tómè e gbe óà Liési Làibìà káa, When Tubman he put *** lead Liberia with	e dəmìa vò suo ke lè e kié-gé ke o ká. he chiefs called *** and 3s met ***	Time Marker	Paragraph boundary change in time, actionary participant
When Tubman started leading Liberia, he called the chiefs and met with them.					
	15		Ke ó luu wò gbe e kié lèá. so that they bush problem it settle ***	Connecting word	
So that they began to settle the bush problem. (is problem spelled wrong?)					
	16a		Tómè a - gée ó mi o ke bíkéia bo pelei.		Release the people from jail

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			Tubman he said they personsthey was jail put out		
			Tubman said they were to release the people in jail.		
	17a		O Suó wà gáà lí o ke békéia bo pelel kill. they Suo and men that they was jail put	NO Marker	
			They released Suo and the men that were in jail.		
	18a b		Tábò, Dóò, wà Téla ni zì lúó káa, Zuápà wà Dòùmpà-mià wà luu wò e wèlè nò kill lí ò ó gbaa bél à yí békéia. Tolbert Doe and Taylor PL their? time during Zuopa and Doumpa peopletheir bush business it get up just also and they they never able it settle?	Time marker P/B Change in time & Participant	
			During Tolbert, Doe, and Taylor's time, Zuopa and Doumpa's bush problem started again and they were never able to settle it.		
	19a b	Kee Lié-sí-mí Sélí luu wéé lí e ke Zuápà wà Dòùmpà but zì lúó káa, bush confusion that it was Zuopa and Sirleaf her day Doumpa they between they it put	repeated action Vivid language 19-21 one they	Theme; Land Confusion between Zuapa & Doumpa was finally settle	
			But during President Sirleaf's time, the bush confusion between Zuopa and Doumpa, they began? to settle it.	Time marker respected each other	
	20a		Sélí e líésí vò wà pélei mià lí ò go péléé pèèle-ze yá yá o kíé mò Sirleaf she head and town people that they from towns two in set they settle on	NO Marker P/B Change in time Participant	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	20b		lé o luu wà e killa yì bèia. and they bush problem it thus in settle?	ILO Marker	
			Sirleaf and the townspeople that were from the two towns, they settled and they the bush business it thus settled.		
	21 ab	Kéé vüdáo wéé dóo year ten one diea	Zuápà wà Dòúmpà o gbaa o kie bèleyapià. Zuopa and Doumpa they now they each other respect	Time Marker Summing Statement	Change in time P/B Change in action
			Some 10 years have passed (and) Zuopa and Doumpa now respect each other.		

A Collateral was Converted to Islam Chart for Analysis⁵

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Comments
			Tòlòma e e zónìè e kε sálìbo-mi ka collateral 3s 3s convert 3s be/do Muslim with		Title e e might be ee
A collateral was converted to Islam					
1	Kéá-zéea, ancient days		pεlèe wà tòlòpè wò gágà. money and cattle business 3s was hard		
A long time ago, money and cattle business was hard (very few people had money or cattle.)					
2			Mia wéié bérí lé nò pεlèe wà tòlòpè nì persons a few who only money and cattle PL o kε o kélèe. 3p be/do 3p hand		lé is probably an existential
Only a very few people had money and cattle.					
3			Mia nò pòjì nì o kília e kε o kélèe, persons only things PL 3p thus 3s be/do 3p hand lé o kε mia kpànazè káa.		lé and all pronouns need clarifying here in Sent 2 and 3.

⁵ This version of the story was not analyzed prior to the workshop. Some questions were put in the analysis column. It is a summary of the original story, so its usefulness is in question. It seems like an explanatory text for the sake of me an outsider. The complete story is below with a partial analysis done by myself.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Comments
			who 3p be/do persons rich with		
Only people with these things were considered rich.					
	4	Ye mi dò àà naa tòlòpè èé pèlèe ká é à kèle kúā When person one 3s look cattle or money to 3s 3s credit ***	mí e kília léè lo míá tòlòpè lè o thus can go people cattle person 3s and 3p kèlèè dò pié hand one to		
	4b		tó e kèle naa o kèlè. and 3s credit look 3p hand		
When (if?) a person is lacking cattle or money and wants to credit (when someone wants to credit cattle or money), that person can go to one of the cattle people and get credit from them.					
	5		M dàa-ye-dàà-zì-dàà e là né tèá-là lí e kε 1s great grandfather3s over child last who 3s be/do gõnè káa, tòlòma-yà kúí-tòò mò kε é e dìè wú-mé-boa. boy child with collateral duck for be/do 3s 3s self rescue		Uncertain on pronouns
My great grandfather gave his last born son as a collateral for (debt?) to himself from trouble.					
	6		Mí o néfúa tòlòma-yàà mòò e kε gó gùù-mi ka.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Comments
			person 3p child collateral on 3s be/do leopard society person with		
			The person to whom they gave the child was with the leopard society.		
	7		Síáñèlè doó yía gùbɔ́ɔ mià nì óò kpílì kè mi dò month one in society people PL 3p feast make person one pié ká-lé mò. to house in		
			Every month the society can make a feast at one person's (member's) house.		
	8		Óò lúó nɔ mia lèe doó doo. 3p day give persons to one		
			They give a day to people (members) one by one. (All members take a turn one by one.)		
	9		E kε gɔ́ o néfúa tɔ́lòma-yàà mòɔ zì lúó ká 3s be/do man 3p child collateral on his day with kε é kpílì kε. be/do 3s feast make		
			It was the turn to make feast for the person they gave the child as collateral to.		
	10	À móò wɔ́ mòɔ,	gɔ́ɔ a yà e zò man 3s planned 3s heart		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Comments
		3s *** business on	mɔ kε e gɔ̃nɛ́x nɔ ó zε wà kpílìa lúó ka. in be/do 3s boy give 3p kill their feast day with		
For this reason, the man planned in his heart to give the boy as an offering to be killed on their feast day.					
	11	Lè gɔ̃nɛ́fúa e e zε wɔ̄ làú maã When boy child 3s 3s kill business *** heard	e wàà e ló Gini. 3s escape 3s went Guinea		
When the child heard about the killing business, he escaped and went to Guinea. (When boy he his? kill news heard, he)					
	12a		E tó yi e bɔ gɔ mò 3s remain there 3s reach man on		
	12b		e dà gbaa sáli-bo-mià bà, 3s fell finally muslims among		
	12c		e lee sí 3s woman take		
			wà lééa o nòòbé ye búnùzè. he and woman 3p children born many		
He remained there until he reached manhood and became a Muslim, he married a woman and he and the woman bore many children.					
	13		Wà wà nòò nì séí o kε sáli-bo-mià ka.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Comments
			They they and child PL all 3p be/do		
			They and their children were all Muslims.		
	14a		O gó gbaa Ginì 3p left finally Guinea		
	14b		o nu Lààbià. 3p came Liberia		
			They finally left Guinea and came to Liberia.		
	15a		Wà o na waà ga, he and his? wife have died		
	15b		kεε wà nòjò o tiá be. but their child 3p still alive		
			He and his wife have died, but their children still live.		
	16a		À tó wa yeáa lé e Gùàbèi 3s name 3p bore is 3s Guan behye		
	16b		kεε à tó but 3s name sáli-bo-mià wa kpóá mòc lé e Sili ki. muslims 3p put on is/was 3s Sleekey		
			His native name was Guan behye, but the Muslims gave him the name Sleekey.		

A Collateral was Converted to Islam Chart B by Translator 2B⁶

Pattern of the Story		No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Comments
title				Tòlòma mi ka collateral with e e zónìè e ke sálibo- 3s 3s convert 3s be/do Muslim		Title e e might be ee
A collateral was converted to Islam						
Setting	1	Kéá-zéea, ancient days		pelèe wà tòlòpè wò e ke gágà. money and cattle business 3s was hard		
A long time ago, money and cattle business was hard (very few people had money or cattle.)						
Setting	2			Mia wélé béké tòlòpè ní persons a few who only pelèe wà PL o ke o kélèz. 3p be/do 3p hand		lé is probably an existential This is a true story, because I stayed with him, he went to mosque in my presence, and his children are still alive today.
Only a very few people had money and cattle.						
Setting	3			Mia nò pòò ní o kilia e ke person only things PL 3p thus 3s be/do 3p hand lé o ke mia kpánazé káa. who 3p be/do person rich with		lé and all pronouns need clarifying here in Sent 2 and 3.
Only people with these things were considered rich.						

⁶ Translator 2B left the workshop early due to illness. This is what he analyzed based on his summary. It is presented here for the storyline.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Comments
Setting	4	Ye mi dò aà nsa tòlòpè EE pelée ká é à kèlè kúä When person one 3s look cattle or money to 3s 3s credit ***	mi e killa lèè lo miá tòlòpè le o thus can go people cattle and person 3s 3p kèlèe dò pié hand one to		
	4b		tó e kèlè nsa o kèlè. and 3s credit look 3p hand		
			When (if?) a person is lacking cattle or money and wants to credit (when someone wants to credit cattle or money), that person can go to one of the cattle people and get credit from them.		
Initial Events	5		M dàa-ye-dàa-zì-dàa e lè né tèá-là lé e ke 1s great grandfather 3s over child last who 3s be/do g5né káa, tòlòma-yà kúi-tòò mó ke boy child 3s with collateral duck for be/do 3s 3s self rescue		Uncertain on pronouns So ✓
			My great grandfather gave his last born son as a collateral for (debt?) to himself from trouble.		
Initial Event	6		Mí o néfúa tòlòma-yà mó e ke S g5 gu5-mi V ka. person 3p child collateral on 3s be/do leopard society person with		So ✓

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Comments
			The person to whom they gave the child was with the leopard society.		
Initial Events	7		<p>Stānjèlè doó yía gùssò mià nì óò kpíllì</p> <p>kè mi dò</p> <p>month one in society people PL 3p feast</p> <p>make person one</p> <p>pié ká-lé mò.</p> <p>to house in</p>		
			Every month the society can make a feast at one person's (member's) house.		
Initial Events	8		<p>Óò lúó nò mia lèe doó doo.</p> <p>3p day give persons to one one</p>		S O V
			They give a day to people (members) one by one. (All members take a turn one by one.)		
Increasing Tension	9		<p>E ke gò o néfúa tòlòma-yàà mò</p> <p>zì lúó ká</p> <p>3s be/do man 3p child collateral on</p> <p>his day with</p> <p>ke é kpíllì ke.</p> <p>be/do 3s feast make</p>		S V O
			It was the turn to make feast for the person they gave the child as collateral to.		
Major Problems	10	A 3s	<p>mòò wò gò a — yà e zò</p> <p>mòò, man 3s planned 3s heart</p> <p>*** mò ke e gòñéé nò ó ze wà</p> <p>business in kpíllìa lúó ka.</p> <p>on be/do 3s boy give 3p kill their</p> <p>feast day with</p>		S V O
			For this reason, the man planned in his heart to give the boy as an offering to be killed on their feast day.		
	11	Lé e	<p>gòñéfúa wà e ló Gini</p> <p>3s escape 3s went Guinea</p>		S V O

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Comments
problems solved		ze wɔ̄ lāū maā When boy child 3s 3s kill business *** heard			
When the child heard about the killing business, he escaped and went to Guinea. (When boy he his? kill news heard, he)					
Closing	12a		E tó yi e bɔ̄ gɔ̄ mò 3s remain there 3s reach man on		SV
closing	12b		e dà gbaa sáll-bo-mià bà, 3s fell finally muslims among		
Closing	12c		e lee sí 3s woman take		
			wà lééa o nòòbè ye búnüzé. he and woman 3p children born many		
He remained there until he reached manhood and became a Muslim, he married a woman and he and the woman bore many children.					
Closing	13		Wà wà nòò ni séí g kɛ sáll-bo-mià ka. They they and child PL all 3p be/do muslims with		SV
They and their children were all Muslims.					
Closing	14a		o gó gbaa Gìnì 3p left finally Guinea		SV
closing	14b		o nu Láàbià. 3p came Liberia		SV
They finally left Guinea and came to Liberia.					

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story	Type of Boundary marker, connector	Comments
Closing	15a		Wà o na waà ga, he and his? wife have died		
closing	15b		kèe wà nòò o tiá be. but their child 3p still alive		
He and his wife have died, but their children still live.					
	16a		À tó wa yeáa lé e Guàbèi 3s name 3p bore is 3s Guanbehye		S V O
Finished	16b		kèe à tó but 3s name sáli-bo-mìà wa kpáá mòò lé e Sílikì. muslims 3p put on is/was 3s Sleekey		S V
His native name was Guanbehye, but the Muslims gave him the name Sleekey.					

A Collateral was Converted to Islam Complete Story Chart with Analysis

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			Tòlòma, Great Grandfather , friend, friends wife, 2 women	Direct quote, semi direct	The Great Grandfather is really a great uncle.
TITLE			Tòlòma e e zónìè e kε sálíbo-mi ka collateral 3s his heart-turned 3s be/do Muslim with		Title
A collateral was converted (his heart turned) to Islam					
Opening	1a	\p	W᷑ íé m à b᷑éé e kéa ye wá nó b᷑o p᷑à ka, story is I it wrote he this is not only just parable with íe w᷑ íé e kε ko p᷑à z᷑ea ka. that story that he was we home home with	No marker	íé seems to be a topic marker. Participants can be fronted for focus even if they are not the subject.
This is a true life story. It is not Fiction					

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
Setting	2a		À gă e gbɛ Gbéí Tɛ́igbɛ́í pélí, lé e kpó Lìiswón Guá wà Lìiswón Kǎáwì its feet it put Gbie Tengbein town and it lay Lesonnon Guam along with Lesonnon Karnwee	No marker	Tells where the story takes place.
	2b		o mò ke é tiá bɔ́ò Gìnì wà Láó Kpɛ́í nì o mò. they on was it still reach Guinea and Lao Kpein PL they on		
It took place (started) in Gbehye Tengbein, Lesonnon Guam, Lesonnon Karnwee, before it extended (continued) to Guinea and Lao Kpein respectively (?).					
Episode 1 Initial event	3ab		M dà-ye-dà-zì-dà a gée là né-téálà lèé, "Gõ, i nu kó ló m kpó	Spkr, speech word listener, No marker	a gèe he said
This may still be setting and story					

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
gets going when Guanbei takes the Agent role.			my great grandfather said over last born to “man you came we go 1s carry m bée pé m ló tolò-pè naà à kèè á lóú-dɔ m mò.” my friend to I go livestock look him hand he lend me on		
My great grandfather told (his) last born son, “Man, come carry me to my friend home, so I can ask him to lend me livestock.”					
	4		À nè-tèálà e kília à tó lé e Gõàbèi . his last born he thus his name that he Guanbei	No marker	Only referent with a name.
His last born's name is Guanbei.					
Increasing tension	5ab c	\p Yé wà o gbe o bø à bée pàa when and they son	a gèe e bée lèe, he said his friend to my friend	Spkr, speech word, listener	a gèe he said

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
		they reach his friend home	<p>"M bée, m nu i pié í kúi-tòò doó lóó-dó m mò."</p> <p>I come you to you duck one lend me on</p>	<p>Marker that points back/tail-head – location change Yé-when/after</p>	
When he and his son reached at his friend's home, he said to his friend, "My friend, I came to you so you can lend me one duck."					
Increasing tension	6a 6b		<p>À bée a wéé-lòò-ke, His friend he asked "Méé-pé íé ì lo à séé nc e méé ke m nyé é ke i génè?"</p> <p>when that you will him it give it behind was my eye he was you expect</p>	<p>Speaker, speech word No listener No marker</p>	
His friend asked, "When will you pay me back so I can be expecting you?"					

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
	7ab	Yé o nyε lúoa when they finish ***ing kpó piàa, date	m dàa-ye-dàà-zì-dàà béε e kúí-tòò-gō dóó kú a nō à lèε. my great grandfatherfriend he duck one held he give him to	Marker that points back—time Yé-when/after	e seems to denote the main line a seems to denote subsequent or concurrent action. See also 8b
		When they finished showing the payback schedule, my great grandfather's friend gave a drake (implied: and he and his son left for home.)			
Major problem Temp problem solved for great grandfather Initial event and problem for Guanbei	8ab c d ef	\p Yé lúó e à kpój e bō lé kúí-tòò sɔɔ lèé gbaa ke à kélèe, he when date it/which he show it reach that duck price it-neg now be his hand	e ló là he go over né-teálàa ká a nō e béε lèé 'tòòma ' ká kélè, last bornwith he give his friend to collateral with that "M gbéa è ke i kélè 'tòòma ' yi é tóá kíli m bà kúí-tòòa sɔɔ gɛ."	Drama? No quote formula Marker that points back/tail-head-time change Yé-when/after	Check this out only kélè is used Or is kélè here something different and there is no quote formula? This is a proclamation; a speech act He delivered the boy to be his collateral and now he is proclaiming it so. The quote is not necessarily indirect or semi-direct. The use of

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			my son he was you hand collateral in he remain also I you duck price see		kélè is still under investigation.
			When the schedule came and he was unable to pay back the duck, he carried his son to his friend as collateral, “Let my son remain with you as a collateral until I pay for your duck.”		
Background and increasing tension	9		(Gõ lé o néfúa tòlòma yà à kèlèe e ke gó-gùù dàa-mì ka. man that they child collateral set his hand he was leopard father with	No marker	
			The man to whom the boy was given as a collateral was the chairman for Human Leopard Society.		
	10		À tó m lo à gée pià e kéa yía lé e' Gó-gùù-dàa-mì.) his name I will him said parable it	No marker	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			be in that it Leopard father		
(So) his name that will be used in this story is ‘Leopard Chairman.’					
	11abc	Lé Then	m dàa-ye-dàà a gèe e gbe Gõàbèi lèé, “Kà i dàa kà tó lèé mò, rím lo my grandfather he said his son Guanbei to You your father you and to on I will m nu tòò.” I came tomorrow	Spkr, speech word, listener Lé used alone as connector-different morpheme as the tone is high. See 12 where tone is low.	a gèe
Then my great grandfather (shortened form) said to his son Guanbei, “Let you and your father stay here, I am going to come back.”					The friend is being called “your father” as is traditional in the culture
Developing conflict	12ab	\p Lè mènè búnùzè e diea, When month many it passed	Gõàbèi dàa lèé gbaa ló e mèí ké é à bo tòòma yi. Guanbei father 3s-neg now go he behind	Lè used and not Ye Time change but not tail head. Move forward in time. <u>Marker that points back</u>	Focus has now shifted to Guanbei. See pronoun use in 13. Agent is now the son. All the “Ye” are in the setting.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			be/do he him made collateral in		L2B says they switch for variety
After several months Guanbei's father did not go back to redeem him whom he had made collateral.					
Developing conflict	13 ab		E tó gbaa kíli o gó-gǔñ-dàa-mìa zì lúó nō kε é nu e zì mi ká ó kpílí kε à ká. he remain now thus they leopard father way/own day give be it came he way/own person with their feast be/do him with	No marker	Change of agent, but pronoun remains Which prn is which here? I think this is correct. Passive is formed with use of "they." It has a referent though referring to the other society members.
He remained thus (a collateral) (until) his master, the Leopard Chairman was given a schedule by the leopard society members to give a human being to be slaughtered for their banquet as it was the norm for their society. (review this translation)					My translation: "He remained so until the day came which was given to the Leopard chairman to bring his own human sacrifice to their feast."
Increasing tension	14abc d	\p ?	Gó-gǔñ-dàa-mìa e gó Zuú e	Spkr, speech word, listener	Note change in pronoun-look for meaning.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
	ef		<p>nu a gèe e na lèε, "Mm lo Gùābèi nò ló-lúó nyéñèepié</p> <p>leopard father he left Zuu he came he said his wife to I will Guanbei give marketday evening</p> <p>ká m zì gùā wéíé ka kε ó ze, yékè bá gèe, 'Mm wéé i wéèe mò.'</p> <p>with my own kuu payment with was they kill don't you said 1sNEG agree you words on</p>	Long quote No marker	a gèe he said Quote in quote Peak: height of tension
			(When) Leopard Chairman came home from their place (Zuu), he said to his wife, "I will give Guanbei on the eve of the market as my due to be slaughtered. Do not say, 'I don't agree!'	Kuu is susu which is a group of people working together to do something. wéíé is payment	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
	15ab		<p>Yé baà gèe kília kε baà yélè kpó m là."</p> <p>when you said thus was, you shame lay me over</p>		Here Ye means if
			If you refuse, then you have made me shame."		
Background	16ab	\p Lè e w̄ɔ̄ gèe e na lèε kε When he story said his wife to be/do	lúo aà tó pèlε ló-lúo é bɔ. day it and? two marketday reach it	Lè is used here again Basically, same time no change. <u>Marker that points back.</u> The narrator inserts some background information.	
		When he gave this information to his wife, it was just two days to the market day.			
Problem solved or developing conflict	17ab		Léa e ló-pòò kε a yà Gôâbèi wii é ló à ká ló yi. woman she commodities was it set Guanbei head he go it with market in	No marker	Change from e to a prn for the agent. See note on 7.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			His wife prepared some farm produce and gave it to Guanbei to carry to the market.	Is it “his wife”? or just “woman”	
	18ab cdefg	\p Lè e kε lópiàa When he was going there	e à pääbo kélè, "Yé baà ló ló yí pénée yékè í nu i méi, she him advise that When you go market in today don't you come you behind bii ì nùá i mèiā ii ló bòò m mó. because you come you back youNEG go/will meet me on	Speaker, listener, speech word Semi direct?, not usual speech word Lè and not Ye tail head time marker	What is pääbo kélè?” Advice that”. kélè is required after this word
			When he was going there, she advised him, “If you go to the market and sell these items, do not come back, because if you come you will not meet me.”		
Problem solved	19ab	\p Lè Gōabbéi e ló ló yía When Guanbei he went market in	léé gbaa nu e méi Guà péleí lé e go yia mó.	Lè location (or time) change tail-head	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			3s-neg now come he behind Guam town that he from in on		
			When Guanbei went to the market, he didn't return to Guam where he came from.		
Episode 2 Initial event	20abc		E tó ló-yíà-mià dò pié e ló e bɔ Kǎáwì pèlè sññó. he follow marketers one to he went he reach Karnweetown near	No marker	Note the prn remains the same for all three clauses here indicating 3 actions in sequence I think. See 7 and 17 where prn changes.
			He followed some marketers and he went as far as Karnwee.		
Major Problem	21a bc	Lè o bɔ yía kε bí àà mí gbaa, When they reach in then night it fallen now	e yìì sùù yí dò mò zi lé e kε he slept grass in one on way that it was gó pìà Kǎáwì áà lò Kpéikpóaa píe. left from Karnweeit began go Kpeikpoah on	Tail-head change in time This could be marker that points back as the verb changes "went" to "reach/arrive".	Lè and Yé What is the difference? Just a matter of variety is what I was told.

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			Night was already falling when they reached Karnwee, (implicit: and because he didn't know anyone there,) he slept at the outskirt of the town along the path that leads from Karnwee to Kpeikpoah.		
	22a bc	\p Yé lèkpèi gàlà e when day dawn it arrive	<p>meí loà pèlè o ke gópià Kåáwi wáà lò Kpéikpóà Mandingo women two they *** left Karnwee and they go Kpeikpoah</p> <p>wáà lò gó wéié naà ó à lís, éé o ló sópò wà wéi ká ke ó lís-dcò. and they go kola seed search they it buy and they went soap and salt with then they sell</p>	Time marker	
Developing conflict			At dawn, two Mandingo women were travelling from Karnwee to		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			Kpeikpoah in search of kola nuts to buy and to also sell soap and salt (check on this translation?).		
	23abc	Lè lee à yé e kε líea e diea, When woman she other she was ahead she passed	Gõăbèi e gó sùua yí e lee à yé Guanbei he left grass in he woman she other e kε zízàáa kú e gă mò. who was behind held her feet on	Lè – time marker (this could be a tail-head referring back to the traveling from 22)	? Sort referents here ? Zízàáa is there a pronoun contracted in here?
Increasing tension			When they were passing on the same path that Guanbei was lying on, he jumped from the grass and held the foot of the woman who was behind. (check translation?)		My translation: When the woman who was ahead passed by, Guanbei got up from the grass, he held the foot of the woman who was behind.
	24abc		Léa e gbéé a gée, "Pε lé è m kū m gă mò bá!" woman she shout she said thing that he my catch my feet on so	Speaker, speech word No listener No marker	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
	29a bcd	\p	<p>Gōâbèi a yízú a gèe, "M tó lè e Gōâbèi káa, m mì wábe, éé m pà wábe."</p> <p>Guanbei he reply he said my name that he Guanbei with my parent not and my home not</p>	<p>Direct quote, no listener <u>No marker</u></p>	A gèe
			Guanbei answered, "My name is Guanbei. I do not have parents and I do not have a home."		
Problem solved	30ab	\p	<p>Loàa o wéé à mò wà ye nì o ló. women they agree him on and born PL they went</p>	<p><u>No marker</u></p>	
			The women met and agreed to carry him (to Guinea.)		
	31a	\p Yé o gó nò when they left just Kpeikpoah	<p>meí loàa o ló Gōâbèi ká Ginì lè wa ye nì</p>	<p>Ye <u>Marker that points back/tail-head?/location marker</u></p>	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			Mandingo women they went Guanbei with Guinea that they born PL o tó gbaa yí lé Gɔ̃abbèi e fàa lé e bɔ gɔ mɔ . they and? now in that Guanbei he grew that he reach man on		
			When they came from Kpeikpoah, they and Guanbei passed Karnwee and went to Guinea. (Check this translation?) When they came from Kpeikpoah, they went with Guanbei to Guinea, they carried him now. Guanbei grew and he reached manhood. (Maybe?)		
Episode 3 Initial event	32ab	\p Lè kèè dò e When year one it pass that	o mia kè lùò lè yí wɔ téá gbaa. they persons do servant *** in business stop now	Time marker Lè used with time No marker	Here is what they do for passive: "They"
	33abc		M dàa-ye-dàà-zì-dàa a gèe là nɔj	Spkr, listener, speech word (why la?)	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			<p>lèε, “Kjà lo sélé gé pié kóá ló ka lekè Gõàbèi na.”</p> <p>my great grandfatherhe said over child to let us go land in to us go with small brother Guanbei search</p>		
			<p>After some years, the slave trade was abolished. My grandfather said to his children, “Let us go into the surrounding countries, let us go in search of your brother.”</p>		
Setting	34abc	\p À lúó e kília *** káa day it thus	<p>kε Gõàbèi àà kε gbaa gõ ká, aà dà sáli bà, aà mε̄-loà nì sí.</p> <p>Then Guanbei he was now man with he fell pray in he Mandingo woman PL take</p>	<p>Absence of Lé and Ye. <u>Marker that points back.</u></p>	<p>What is kε? Where does it go? With the connector or before the main clause? I think it means “then” here. Note the pronoun for Guanbei</p> <p>This is additional background filling in so that his refusal later makes sense.</p>

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			At that time, then Guanbei has grown to manhood, joined the muslim religion, and has married some Mandingo women.		
	35a		(À tó lé sáli-bo- mìà wa kpó à mòɔ lé Sílíkì káa.) His name that Muslims they lay him on that Sleekey with	No marker	
			(The Muslims named him Sleekey.)		
	36a b cd		Loà pèèlè lé o ló à ká Ginìä wa gèe à lèè “Bi wá méi-mi kpó-kpó ka, women two that they went him with Guinea they said him to you not Mandingo truly with î go Lààbíà , kà i na nì , éé kà bà nóò nì	Speaker, listener speech word No marker	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			<p>kà lo ka pà."</p> <p>you from Liberia you your wife PL and you your child PL you go with home</p>		
Developing conflict			<p>The two Mandingo women who carried him to Guinea said to him, "You are not a born Mandingo man, you are from Liberia. Let you and your wife and your children go to your home.</p>		
	37abcde		<p>o gó Ginì o nu o yà Kpèí pèlèí, o o zì lúú lí o yà gbaa à yí o pà ka. they left Guinea they came they set Kpein town they they way land buy they set now him in their? home with</p>	<p>No marker</p>	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			They left Guinea and came to Kpein and settled, they bought farmland and made it their permanent home.		
Increasing tension	38abc	\p Yé m dàa-ye-dàa-zì- dàa wa là nòò nì, à bɛ̃-ye- mìà nì o ló Gɔ̃abbèi náá sía, when my greatgrandfather they over child PL him relatives PL they went Guanbei search ***	o ló o dà Gìnì wà Màleè nì o mò. they went they fell Guinea and Mali PL they on	Yé connector, back to story line back to 32. Marker that points back/tail-head	
			(When) My great grandfather and his children including his relatives went in search of Guanbei, they went as far as Guinea and Mali.		
	39a	Kee but	o à ma gbaa kélè Gɔ̃abbèi wà o pié kéi mìà waà nu Lààbíà o yáá Kpɛ̃. they him hear now that Guanbei and	Connecting word	Contrast

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			<p>they to house people have came Liberia they sitting Kpein</p>		
			But they heard that Guanbei and his families have crossed to Liberia and are settled in Kpein.		
Developing conflict	40abc		<p>M dàa-ye-dàà nì o nu gbaa o mεí Lààbià , o ló Kpεí pεlεí o Gɔáabèi ` wà my grandfather PL they came now they behind Liberia they went Kpein town they Guanbei and o na nì, à nòò nì o gɛ yi. they wife PL him child PL they see in</p>	No marker	
			My great grandfather and his people (who were looking for Guanbei) came back to Liberia and met him and his families in Kpein.		

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
Increasing tension	41	\p	<p>Wa gèe à lè, "Kà lo kòa pa." they said him to let us will our home</p> <p>They said to him, "Let us go to our home."</p>	<p>Speaker, listener, speech word <u>No marker</u></p>	
Problem solved	42a	\p Kεε but	<p>a gèe, "Gbáoò ! he said No</p> <p>But Guanbei responded, "No!"</p>	<p>No listener <u>Connecting word</u></p>	Contrast VSS
	43abc	cd	<p>Mím bèi gbaa lóò, bii maa luú-lí gbaa zee, ee m nòòbé ni kù aà ke gbùò,</p> <p>1sNEG able now go because I land buy now here and I children PL group it was great</p> <p>é bèi zeé luú wá m kélè kòa pà Gbéé Téigbéé ké mia sùu lé maà o sòlòboa</p> <p>it able again land not my hand</p>		
		d			

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			our home Gbie Tengbein was persons such that I they acquire ó yà à yi." they set it in		
			I am not able to go Tengbein again, because I have purchased land here, and I have many children, again I do not have land in Tengbein so all these people can settle there.		
	44a		Zí e dəa ká lé Gɔ̃abbèi e té yàá gbaa Láó Kpɛ́tā lé bɛ. back he stood with that Guanbei he and sitting now Lao Kpain that this	No marker	
			These were the reasons why Guanbei remained in Lao Kpain.		
Closing	45a	\p	Kpɛ́i mìà bɛ́é o à té kpó wáà sì Gbéi Silíkì . Kpein people also they him name lay	No marker	

Pattern of the Story	No.	Connectors	Story – L2 analysis post-workshop of original story A Collateral was Converted to Islam	Speech/Boundary markers (combined)	Comments
			and they called Gbie Sleekey		
			The Kpein people named him Gbei Sleekey, (because he hailed from Gbei Tengbein.)		

1. Who is in story from beginning to end: Great grandfather and Guanbei
2. Who is quoted directly: great grandfather III (drama) III, Guanbei III, Leopard chairman II, his wife 1 semi-direct, 2 women II semi direct I, friend I
3. Who gives a command: Great Grandfather 3, leopard chair, leopard wife, 2 women 35
4. Who thinks about a situation and decides: Grandfather 8, wife, 2 women
5. Who judges others in the story: Leopard chair wife (interesting because she is perhaps a low status and a minor character? Yet saves Guanbei) she goes against her husband's plans. Guanbei ultimately goes against his father
6. Who solves the problem: Leopards wife and the 2 women who help, Guanbei when he refuses to move
7. To whom are the other participants responding: Guanbei
8. With whom does the narrator sympathize? Guanbei

Great Grandfather and Guanbei are the major characters. The Leopard chair and the 2 women are secondary as well as Leopard chair wife.

Great grandfather introduced in relation to story teller

Only Guanbei gets a name

Leopard chairman is introduced as "his friend" then his role as chairman is especially mentioned because it affects the story.

The two women are identified by their tribe.

Semi direct are in increasing tension or developing conflict, spoken by a secondary character. In this case, all women.

These quotations marked semi-direct may not be at all. They may be direct. The first one with only **kéle** is a proclamation. The 2nd one is required because of the word advice. All the quotations themselves are stated in a direct manner with proper pronouns for a direct quotation.

Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers in a Natural Story and a Bible story ***

	L2 Collateral original	Mark 5:1-20
No marker	1,14-15,26,29,30,41,45 = 6	
Connecting word	42-43=2	
Time word	25=2	
Time marker	12, 22,32,=5	
Location marker		
Tail-head connection	18,19,31,38,=4	
Marker that points back	5,8,16,31?,34,=5	
Burger structure		
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: Most of the paragraphs in the natural story begin with no marker. Yé and Lè seem to be used variably to point back or as time markers. More stories need to be examined to determine a difference. Many of the markers that point back are like tail-head connectors as they often refer to something previous but they are not necessarily sequential sentences. Quotations may or may not start a new paragraph. This needs further examination. See 14-15, 24-25, 26-28, 41-42.

Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within the paragraphs in a Natural Story and a Bible story

	L2 Collateral original	Mark 5:1-20
No marker	2,3,4,6,9,10,13,14-15?,17,20,24,27,28,33,35,36,37,40,41, 44= 20	
Connecting word	39,42=2	
Time word	11=1	
Time marker	23,33,=2	
Location marker		
Tail-head connection	21?=1	
Marker that points back	7,21,=2	
Burger structure		
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: No marker may indicate the sentences are part of a paragraph. There are many tail-head connectors which are also markers that point back. It may be that these mark paragraphs boundaries.

APPENDIX B
MARK TEXT CHARTS

Language 1

Unanalyzed texts charts

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ nyènèŋ wɔŋ dùfòiŋ naŋ gòàà dìì (Jesus Calms a Storm) Mark 4:35-41 L1							Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
Setting	35ab	\p Ke dòò diɛŋ koya *** day that ***	wo Jisè naŋ wòò aŋ jòà màngjèwèŋ NCP1 Jesus PST say NCP3-PL child follower-his								
	35c	guùŋ bi e one upon evening	"Niàŋ wiŋ nìngè" cross we opposite side	fàa bà aŋ juwoò NCP4 side other NCP4 lake							
		On the evening of that same day,	Jesus said to his disciples, saying, "Let us cross from one side to the other side of the lake								
	36a	Yèè So	àŋ naŋ jòò e faaàŋ. they PST left *** crowd								
	36b		Aŋ jòà màngjèwèŋ nyàŋ naŋ sèè wɔŋ gòò sùà wɔŋ yèè wo Jisè jaa wa sùà te lè, NCP3-PL child follower-his the PST enter NCP4 sitting used to in NCP4 one NCP1 Jesus sitting yèè yaà nyiŋ naŋ kò.								

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ nyènèŋ wəŋ dùfòi naŋ gòàà dìi (Jesus Calms a Storm) Mark 4:35-41 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	36c		and he-and they PST go		
	36d		Maŋ gɔ joo bá yaào wa kobe bi. PL4 boat differentsome was-there used to to that		
			So they left the crowd. His disciples got into the boat that Jesus was already in, and he and they went. There were other boats there also. (Other boats were there at that place.)		
Initial Event	37ab		Àŋ naŋ wa nɔŋ kò e wùiyèè diŋ kineŋ wɔŋ dùfòi gbee yèwà dìi, they PST used to just go *** water upon suddenly NCP4 storm big started under yè e bɔiŋ nè naŋ tɔ̄tù jòwa and *** wave the PST begin rising è seè wɔŋ gò sùà, it enter NCP4 boat in e joo tòloò wè wɔŋ gò wɔŋ dià it remain small for NCP4 boat it fill *** water		
	37c				
	37d				
	37e				
			They had just gone on the water, suddenly a big storm started, and the waves began rising, it/they enter the boat, it remained small for the boat to fill (with) water.		
Major Problems	38a		Wo Jisè yaà wa wɔŋ gò ko jèwè NCP1 Jesus was used to NCP4 boat to behind		
	38b		wò naŋ hè e diŋ nè e pulòe diŋ		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ nyènèŋ wɔŋ dùfòiŋ naŋ gòàà dìi (Jesus Calms a Storm) Mark 4:35-41 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	38c		he PST put *** head-his the *** pillow wò yaà manj jàwè. he was sleep		
	38d		Aŋ jàà mānjèwèuŋ nyàŋ nauŋ tún̄gò yèè nyààŋ, NCP3-PL child follower-his the PST-him woke and they-say		
	38e		"Kààmcoŋ, mùŋ gò kpeéŋ kè è yàinj hinie eiŋ fà?" teacher you not care that we PROG-we coming we die		
			Jesus was in the back of the boat, he had put his head on a pillow and he was asleep. (sleep is a noun here, place of sleep?) His followers woke him and they said, "Teacher don't you care that we are coming to die?"		
Problems Solved	39abc	\p	Wo Jisè naŋ yèwè dìi wo sie wo wòò wɔŋ dùfòiŋ wààŋ, NCP1 Jesus PST got up ground he stand he say NCP4 storm he-said		
	39d		Nòŋ gíli!" be quiet		
	39e	Yèè and	wò naŋ wòò e bɔiŋ nè wààŋ, he PST saying *** wave the he-said "Gòàì dìi!" Calm down		
	39f				

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ nyènèŋ wəŋ dùfòiŋ naŋ gòàà dìi (Jesus Calms a Storm) Mark 4:35-41 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	39gh		Wəŋ dùfòiŋ naŋ gòàà dìi, yè e dìinaj nòŋ gili. NCP4 storm PST calm down and *** ground-PST be quiet		
			Jesus got up he stood , he said to the storm, (he) said, "Be quiet!" And he said to the waves, (he) said, "Calm down!" The storm calmed down, and the whole area became quiet.		
	40a 40b 40c	Kpeɪŋ Then	wo Jisè naŋ dàwè aŋ jà māŋjèwèuŋ nyàŋ wààŋ, NCP1 Jesus PST ask NCP3-PL child follower-his the he-said "Wèe kiiŋ e jùùe nyènèiŋ ? for what *** fear do-you Kò nìŋ kùwiè nɔŋ è hàawe gbiŋ?" where youPL have-pstNEG still faith any		
			Then Jesus asked his disciples, he said, "For what is fear doing you? (Why are you afraid?) Where do you have any faith? (verb has the stem, tone to mark negative, plural subject form and is past)		
Closing	41abc 41d 41d	\p Kεε But	e jùù zàzà naŋ nyiŋ wa dìè e koo sùa yè àŋ naŋ kùunò dàwè nyiŋ bi eféemàŋ nyààŋ, *** fear tremble PST them used to fill *** body in and they PST started ask them self among they-say "Bòò naŋ yaà wo felaa wɛɛ? Who was NCP1 man this Wəŋ dùfòiŋ pɛɛ yè e bɔiŋ nɛ kàiŋ nɛ jɔlɔnŋ dìi !" NCP4 storm also and *** wave the even it obey-him under		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ nyènèŋ wɔŋ dùfòiŋ naŋ gòàà dìi (Jesus Calms a Storm) Mark 4:35-41 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
			But the fear-trembles filled them in their bodies and they started asking among themselves, they said, "Who is this man? (naŋ here with yaa is the present tense "is") The storm also and even the waves obey him."		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ sùngò wo felaa kùwiè aŋ jinàŋ naanààn (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
Setting 1a	1a	\p	Wo Jisè yèè aŋ jà màngjèwèun nyàŋ naŋ kò wàŋ fàaa bà wàŋ juwoò koo ko Galalii, maŋ kpàlàùŋ kpàlàùŋ Gèlesà maŋ sùà. NCP1 Jesus and NCP3-PL child follower PL PST go NCP2 side other NCP2 lake near NCP8 Galilee they surround surround Geresa in.		
			Jesus and his disciples went to the other side of the lake of Galilee, in the region of Geresa.		
	2ab		Wo Jisè naŋ wa nɔŋ fòlò wàŋ gò sùà wò naŋ dè fa, NCP1 Jesus PST used to just come out NCP2 boat in he PST get down soon		Are 2ab really connecting clauses?
	2c		wò naŋ dèènè wo felaa bà wo yèc naŋ fòlò e bìè maŋ hùaàŋ sùà kobè bi.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ sùngò wo felaa kùwìè aŋ jinàŋ naanààn (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	2d		<p>he PST meet NCP1 man some NCP1 one PST come out NCP6 bush NCP5-PL grave in to that</p> <p>Wo felaaaà kuwa wa wo jinàŋ naanààn manjèweuŋ</p> <p>NCP1 man had used to NCP1 spirit bad behind -him</p>		
			<p>Jesus just came out of the boat (and) as soon as he got down, he was met one man , the one coming from the grave site that were in that place (to that place). The man had an evil spirit behind him</p>		
	3a		<p>yèè maŋ hùan màŋ fèemàŋ nɔŋ wò jawe wa. and NCP5-PL grave they betweenjust he sleep used to</p> <p>Wo nyùùŋ gbiŋ fòuŋ wa bɛìŋ bɛnɛŋ dikìà màŋ jò.</p> <p>NCP1 person all 3S NEG used to again NOTable tie NCP5-PL chain</p>		
	3b		<p>and he used to sleep between the graves. Nobody was not able to chain him (double negative)</p>		
	4a		<p>E teenga zimgbe àŋ dèkèuŋ wa maŋ gòlò yèè maŋ kùàŋ NCP6 time plenty they tie-him used to NCP5-PL feet and NCP5-PL hand</p> <p>kεε e teenga gbiŋ wò kεtε kεtε wa maŋ jò màŋ yèè wo nyìmè nyìmè maŋ kàì maŋ yàuŋ maŋ gòlò maŋ.</p>		
	4b				
	4c				
	4d				

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ sùngò wo felaa kùwìè aŋ jinàŋ naanààn (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	4ef		<p>but NCP6 time all he cut cut used to NCP5-PL chain the and he break break NCP5-PL iron they on-him NCP5-PL foot the</p> <p>Wò yaà wa egààŋ zimgbe yèè wo nyùùŋ bà gbiŋ fòuŋ wa bénèŋ. he was used to power plenty and NCP1 person some all 3S NEG used to able-him</p>		
			<p>Many times they would tie his feet and hands, but everytime he cut the chains and broke the irons that were on him on the feet.</p> <p>He was very strong and no one could able him (control him or over power him).</p>		
	5a 5bcd	E dùùm yèè NCP6 night and NCP5-PL day	<p>wò sia maŋ hùaŋ màŋ yèè maŋ toò maŋ fèemàŋ, he stand NCP5-PL grave the and NCP5-PL hill they between,</p> <p>wò kpaŋ yèè wò bémàŋ le dùò lε wò nεemun nèèmùŋ wuŋ bi. he shout and he take NCP7 rock the he hurt hurt him that</p>		
			Day and night he stands between the graves and the hills and shouts and he takes rocks and hurts himself.		
Initial Event 1	6ab 6c	\p Kpeɪŋ	<p>Wò yaà wa kóbè dii yèè wò naŋ yèmè wo Jisè. He was used to to far and he PST look/saw NCP1 Jesus</p> <p>wò naŋ dùòŋ, he PST ran</p>		Check on use of "wa" "Used.to" throughout the story. Could it be a simultaneous action in order to connect?

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ sùngò wo felaa kùwìè aŋ jinàŋ naanààn (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	6de	Then	wo ka wo dè maŋ gèènùunŋ màŋ dì ko fɛɛfènùunŋ, he go NCP1 get down NCP5-PL knee-his the under NCP8 in front-him		
			He was far off (far place) and he saw Jesus. Then he ran, he got down on his knees in front of him,		
	7ab		yèè wò naŋ kpààŋ seiiŋ wààŋ, "Jisè, Jòàfèlàà Dàyà Gaàŋ Gbeeò! and he PST shout loud saying Jesus Son God powerful big		
	7c		Kìiŋ mìnŋ manaŋ maim nyènèŋ ? what you want me do Kòneèŋ, nyènèŋ wèè Dayà, bò mìnŋ nimilaim!"		
	7de		Please do-it for God do not you punish-me		
			and he shouted loudly saying, "Jesus, Son of the Big powerful God." What do you want to do to me? Please for God's sake, do not punish me.		
Setting 1b	8a		Wò yaà wa tèè woo esabù kè, wo Jisè yaà wa woo wààŋ, "jinàŋ naanààanŋ, folà wo felaa wéè ko sùà!"		
	8b		He was used to this said because/reason that NCP1 Jesus was used to said saying		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ sùngò wo felaa kùwìè aŋ jinàŋ naanààn (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
			spirit bad come out NCP1 man this in		
			He said this because Jesus was saying, "Bad spirit, come out from inside this man."		
Increasing Tension 1	9ab 9bc	\p Yèè and	wo Jisè naŋ dawè wààŋ, “ E deèum mòè naŋ yaà bòò?” NCP1 Jesus him ask saying NCP6 name you PST was what Wo felaà naŋ fasàì wààŋ, “ Edeè mè naŋ yaà Zimgbe esabù kè è naiŋ mùŋgò ke gbòò!” NCP1 man him answer saying Name my PST was Plenty because/reason that ? we large NCP4 group		
			And Jesus asked saying, "What is your name?" The man answered, saying, "My name is Plenty because we are a large group."		
Major Problems 1	10a 10b	Yèè and	wò naŋ nòòŋ pòòwò wo Jisè paŋ wèè wo go nàŋ gè aŋ jinàŋ naanààŋnyàŋ màŋ kpàlìùŋ kpàlìùŋ miijì sùà. he PST just beg NCP1 Jesus continuously for he not *** take NCP3-PL spirit bad all of them the surround surround area in		
			And he just kept begging Jesus that he not take out all the bad spirits from in the area.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ sùngò wo felaa kùwìè aŋ jinàŋ naanàŋ (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
Setting 1c	11	Kεε but	ke gbòò aŋ nyuàŋ gbee bà yaà wa e gbèe nyiŋ nè wɔŋ toòò bula kobè bi ko gbilie. NCP4 group NCP3-PL pig big some was used to it near them the NCP2 hill side to that NCP8 eating ;		
			But a large group of pigs was near them to the side of the hill eating.		
Major Problems 1 (cont.)	12a 12b 12c	Yèè and	aŋ jinàŋ naanàŋnyarŋ naŋ kùunò pòwò Jisè nyààŋ, NCP3-PL spirit bad all of them PST started begging Jesus saying “Tuàŋ wi kobè aŋ nyùàŋ nyarŋ, gè wi nyààŋ diɛŋ e jòà nyiŋ sùà.” send us to NCP3-PL pig all of them allow us mouth-our upon it enter them in		
			And all the bad spirits started begging Jesus saying, "Send us to the all the pigs. Allow us to enter into them."		
Problems Solved 1	13a 13bcd		Wò naŋ nyiŋ gè nyààŋ diɛŋ, He PST them take mouth upon yèè àŋ naŋ fòlò wo felaa ko sùà aŋ ka aŋ jòà aŋ nyùàŋ nyarŋ ko sùà. and they PST come out NCP1 man to in they go they enter NCP3-PL pig all of them to in		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ sùngò wo felaa kùwìè aŋ jinàŋ naanààn (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	13efghi	Yèè And	<p>ke gbòò aŋ nyuàŋ tèmèè yii esòngò aŋ nyuàŋ tààsùùŋ tiyèe aŋ gbiŋ naŋ dùòŋ aŋ dèyà e toonyàa vauŋvàùŋ lii aŋ ka aŋ sèè ko kòii aŋ oo jeeè.</p> <p>NCP4 group NCP3-PL pig large that almost NCP3-PL pig thousand two NCP3-PL all PST ran they went down NCP6 mountain side high that they go they got NCP8 water they *** stay</p>		
			<p>He permitted them and they came out of the man inside and they went , they entered inside all the pigs.</p> <p>And the large groups of pigs almost 2000 all ran, they went down the high mountainside and they go, they got in water, they stay.</p>		
EPISODE 2, Initial Event 2 Increasing Tension 2	14a	\p –	<p>Aŋ kpàkòò nyaŋ yaà wa yéèmè aŋ nyùàŋ nyaŋ dięŋ nyàŋ naŋ dùòŋ They men all of them was used to look NCP3-PL pig all of them upon they PST ran</p> <p>aŋ ka aŋ bààyè ebò lèè ko jawai yèè maŋ kpàlàùŋ kpàlàùŋ maŋ gbiŋ sùà. they go they spread news this NCP8 town and NCP5-PL surround surround the all in Anyùùŋ naŋ kò wèè aŋ yemè kè kiŋ naŋ kaàŋ,</p>		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ sùngò wo felaa kùwìè aŋ jinàŋ naanààn (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	14d		people PST go for they see that what PST happen		
			The men who were watching the pigs ran and spread the news to the town and all the surrounding area. People went in order to see that which happened,		
	15ab	yèè nààŋ àŋ naŋ hnè kobè Jisèi, and when they PST came Jesus	àŋ naŋ yèmè wo felaaà aŋ jinàŋ naanàànzimbe nyàŋ yaà wa ko sùà wɔ. they PST look/saw NCP1 man NCP3-PL spirit bad plenty was used to NCP8 in him(?)		Yee seems to be able to act at sentence and higher levels. Maybe should be capitalized.
	15cde		Wò jaao wa, wò naŋ gòàì maŋ dèè yèè e jiikèeuŋ nè gbiŋ naŋ kpεelèε, he sitting used to he PST where NCP5-PL close and NCP6 sense-his the all PST equal		
	15f		yèè e jùù naŋ nyiŋ nyènèŋ. and NCP6 afraid PST them do		
			And when they came to Jesus, they saw the man the plenty bad spirits in him. He was sitting close and all his senses were correct and fear did them (they got afraid).		
	16a		Aŋ yè nyanŋ naŋ wa yèmè e kei bi sùà nyanŋ naŋ gbàì aŋ nyùùŋ nyanŋ jii e nyaaiŋ dè e keiε naŋ kààŋ wo		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ sùngò wo felaa kùwìè aŋ jinàŋ naanààn (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
			<p>They felaaa kèenèŋ aŋ jinàŋ naanàànnyanj, yèe e kèi aŋ nyùàŋ nyanj.</p> <p>NCP6 things that in all of them</p> <p>PST explain NCP3-PL person all of them</p> <p>heart NCP6 concerning this NCP6</p> <p>thing PST happen NCP1 man having</p> <p>NCP3-PL spirit bad all of them and</p> <p>thing NCP3-PL pig all of them</p>		
			These other people who saw all of this explained their heart concerning these things what happened to the man having all the bad spirits and the things concerning all the pigs.		
Major Problems 2	17a	\p Weè tii for that	<p>àŋ naŋ dàwè wo Jisè wèe wo</p> <p>they yewà wɔŋ fuɔŋ nyiŋ nɔŋ sùa.</p> <p>PST leave NCP2 country their POSS in</p>		
			For that they asked Jesus to leave their country.		
	18a 18b 18cd	\p Eteengaà wo Jisè yaà wa sèè sùa wɔŋ gɔà sùa Iε, time NCP1 Jesus was used to got NCP2 in in boat is	<p>wo felaaa wo yèo aŋ jinàŋ naanààn</p> <p>nyanj yaà wa weè ko sùa</p> <p>wo nauŋ pɔwà wààŋ,</p> <p>"Tò miŋ dèum manjèwε e ka!"</p> <p>NCP1 man NCP1 one NCP3-PL spirit bad</p> <p>all of them was used to for NCP8</p> <p>in him? him beg saying</p> <p>let me get-you behind us go</p>		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ sùngò wo felaa kùwìè aŋ jinàŋ naanààn (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
			The time Jesus was getting into the boat, the man who had all the bad spirits in him begged him saying, "Let me follow you, we go."		
Problems Solved 2	19a	\p Kεε But	wo Jisè gòun wa nyimèè. NCP1 Jesus not used to agree		
	19bcd	Kεε but	wò nauŋ woò wààŋ, "Kèè ko gboo moo kobè kepoo mɔ̄ŋ yèe muŋ gbaì nyinj jii wèè e nèeŋ miàŋ wo Kanaà naŋ nyènèŋ weèum lè yèe e deweè mìŋ naum yèmè ke nyowo lè." he him told saying Go back to home *** to family your and you explain them heart for NCP6 thing I NCP1 lord PST do for-you and NCP6 way I you look/saw NCP4 sorrow		
			But Jesus did not agree. But he told him saying, "Go back to your home to your family and you explain heart to them for the things I the lord did your you and the way I had mercy on you. "		
Closing	20ab	\p Kpein then	wo felaaà naŋ kεè wo kòè maŋ Tàta maŋ Jàwà Zìiyà maŋ sùà, NCP1 man PST went back NCP1 pass NCP5-PL area NCP5-PL town ten wò gè wòò e nèeŋ wo Jisè naŋ nyènèŋ weèun lè. he take saying NCP6 thing NCP1 Jesus PST do for-him		
	20c				

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè naŋ sùngò wo felaa kùwìè aŋ jinàŋ naanààn (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	20d	Yèè and	è naŋ wa fòònò anyùùŋ nyàŋ gbiŋ naun̄ wa kumiè nyàŋ. it PST used to surprize people all of them all ? used to hear all of them		
			Then the man went back passing through the area of the ten towns saying the things that Jesus did for him. And it used to surprise all the people that heard.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè yaà aŋ jjàkàinjɔa nyàŋ (Jesus Blesses Little Children) Mark 10:13-16 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
Setting	13a	\p	Anyùùŋ bà naŋ wa hìèŋ aŋ jjàkàinjɔa koɓɛ Jisèi		
Initial Event	13b		wèè wo gbùwà nyìŋ maŋ kùàŋ dien, people some PST used to bring NCP3-PL little child to Jesus for NCP1 lay them NCP5-PL hand upon kɛɛ anyùùŋ màŋjèwè nyàŋ naŋ nyìŋ wa gbuuyè wèè aŋ hɔanè yɛi nyènɛŋ.		
	13c		but people behind PL they them used to speak for NCP3-PL stop that doing		
			Some people brought children to Jesus so that he could lay hand on them, but the disciples they spoke to them so that they could stop doing that.		
Major Problems	14ab	Eteengaà wo Jisè	wò naŋ wa tuù he PST used to vex		
Problems Solved	14c	naŋ tɛɛ yɛmɛ le,	yèè wò naŋ wò anyùùŋ màŋjèwèŋ nyàŋ wààŋ, “Dàngeɪŋ” aŋ jjàkàinjɔa nyàŋ aŋ hnàŋ		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè yaà anj jòàkàinjòa nyàñ (Jesus Blesses Little Children) Mark 10:13-16 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	14def	time NCP1 Jesus PST this saw is	ko nèèñ miñj, bò nìñ kilià nyij kùàñ feñj, esabù kè e Kànà Dayàa èyaà wèè anyùùñ mààñ nyèèñ. and he PST said people follower his saying leave NCP3-PL little child PL they come NCP8 to me do not you put them hand before because/reason that NCP6 Lord God is for people like these		
		The time Jesus heard this,	he was vexed, and he said to his disciples, "leave the little children they come to me, do not put hand before them, because the kingdom of God is for people like these.		
Closing	15ab		Mìn yàìñ wòò sùà etçøbaaa kè, wo nyùnòñj gbiñ gò jòòlò è Kànà Dayàa kùàñ diì mààñ wò jòàkàinj wò, julñfò wo fè nàwèè kà è kanaunj nè sùà." I am you saying in truth that NCP1 anyone who not obey Lord God hand under like NCP1 little child the forever he never tomorrow go it kingdomthe in		
			I am telling you the truth that, anyone who will not obey the Lord God like these little children will never enter into his kingdom.		
	16a 16b	Yèè and	wò nañ bémè anj bënyeëè nyaj gbiñ guùñ guùñ ko kùàñ sùàunj niñj, he PST took NCP3-PL children all of them all one wo nyij gbùwà manj kùàñ dieñ, he them lay NCP5-PL hand upon yèè wò nañ nyij gbìèñ ezòòlo manjewé. and he *** them sent blessing behind.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Wo Jisè yaà aŋ jòkàinjɔa nyàŋ (Jesus Blesses Little Children) Mark 10:13-16 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	16c				
			And he took all the children one by one into his arms, he laid his hand on them and he sent blessing behind them.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Ke kàbànè anyuùn yèmè wɔŋ bù gbeewè jèwè diɛŋ nyàŋ (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard) Mark 12:1-12 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
Setting	1a 1bc	\p Kpein Then	<p>wo Jisè naŋ nyin gbòò kɔɔ maŋ kàbanè</p> <p>sùà wààŋ, "Wo fela a ba naŋ wa</p> <p>tòmò wɔŋ bù gbeewè jèwèun nɔ̀ŋ yèè wo</p> <p>naŋ nyùùŋ wɔŋ gbiŋ maŋ gbèmèèŋ.</p> <p>NCP1 Jesus PST them speak to them NCP5-PL parable in</p> <p>saying NCP1 man certain PST</p> <p>used to work NCP2 farm yard back POSS</p> <p>and he PST plant NCP2 all NCP5-PL</p> <p>vine</p>		
	1cd		<p>Wò naŋ wuŋ guulò yèè wò naŋ tòmò</p> <p>wɔŋ goo wèè maŋ gbèmèèŋ komaŋ</p> <p>màŋ tìila.</p> <p>he PST it fence and he PST work</p> <p>NCP2 hole for NCP5-PL vine seed they</p> <p>mash</p>		
			<p>wò naŋ nyèlè diɛŋ.</p> <p>he PST build NCP2 scaffold for NCP2 farm-?</p> <p>look/saw upon</p>		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Ke kàbànè anyuùn yèmè wɔŋ bù gbeewè jèwè diεŋ nyàŋ (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard Mark 12:1-12 L1)	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	1e 1fg	Yèè and Kilà NCP6 then Kpeinj Then	wo naŋ kiɛŋ wɔŋ bù bi anyuùn tòmò bù bà wèè àŋ tomàŋ aŋ pàawà ejotì yèè wò naŋ kò ko kɔi wɔŋ fuŋj bà sùà. he PST give NCP2 farm that people work farm some for them work them pay tax and he PST go NCP8 foreign NCP2 country some in		
			<p>Then Jesus spoke to them in a parable saying, "A certain man made a farm in his backyard and he planted it all with vines."</p> <p>He built a fence around it and he dug a hole for the mashing of the vine seeds.</p> <p>And then he built a tower/platform to keep watch over the farm.</p> <p>Then he gave the farm to some farm working people for them to work (and) to pay tax and he went to a foreign country.</p>		
Initial Event	2ab		E tèèngà maŋ gbèmèenj komanj màŋ kpà naŋ hai yèè wò naŋ tòŋ wo bɔijjà kobè anyuùn nyaj ko bùi wèè aŋ paawà ejotunj nè. NCP6 time NCP5-PL vine seed pick PST reach and he PST send NCP1 servant there people all of them NCP8 farm for NCP3-PL pay tax-his his		
			The time came for the seed picking, and he sent a servant there to the people on the farm for his tax.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Ke kàbànè anyuùn yèmè wàŋ bù gbeewè jèwè dię̄ nyàŋ (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard Mark 12:1-12 L1)	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
Increasing Tension	3abc	Kεε but	aŋ nyùùŋ nyaj ko bùi naŋ kùwò wo bɔijjàa, auŋ bùlà, wo kɛlɛ̄e le siwè foo. NCP3-PL person all of them NCP8 farm PST caught NCP1 servant him beat he went back hand empty		2 nd clause is a strange construction, perhaps a contraction?
			But all of the people on the farm caught the servant, beat him, he went back empty handed.		
	4a 4b	Yèè and	wò kèenèŋ bùo naŋ bɛiŋ tùoŋ wo bɔijjà joo bà, àŋ naŋ wii bùlò e dì auŋ sìà sàngè. he owner farm-? PST again send NCP1 servant different some they PST that one beat NCP6 head him made shame		
			And the farm owner sent another servant, (and) they beat him on his head, shaming him.		
	5ab 5bcd	Yèè and	wo felaa naŋ bɛiŋ tùoŋ wo bɔijjàa bà, wii wun, àŋ nauŋ jiwè. NCP1 man PST again send NCP1 servant some that one him they kill and him they killed; Wò naŋ tùoŋ aŋ bɔijjà zimgbe, àŋ naŋ bùlò aŋ bà nyiŋ, aŋ jiwà aŋ bà nyiŋ. he PST send NCP3-PL servant plenty they PST beat them some PL they kill them some PL		
			And the man again sent another servant, and that one they killed. He sent plenty of servants, they beat some of them and they killed some of them.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Ke kàbànè anyuùnì yèmè wòò bù gbeewè jèwè diéñ nyàñ (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard Mark 12:1-12 L1)	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
Major Problems	6a		<p>Wo nyùùñ guùñ nòñ nauñ wa naàñ jòò siwè wèè wo tuàñ e tèènè mààñ wò jòàfèlàà jiiuñ nòñ.</p> <p>NCP1 person one just him used to now remain hand. for he to send NCP6 *** like child-male heart POSS</p>		
	6b	E	<p>wuñ nañ yaà wo nyùùñ dìàmaàñ wo nañ wa tuòñ kòbè anyuùnì nyàñ ko bùi.</p> <p>he PST was NCP1 person last he PST used to send there people all of them NCP8</p>		
	6c	dewe	<p>Wò nañ woò wààñ, 'Kà haawè àñ do nàñ kiëñ wo jòàfelaa miòñ e bèèjàa.'</p> <p>he PST told saying I believe they will *** give NCP1 child-male my</p>		
	6d	gbio sùà, way all in			
			<p>Only one person he had left to send, his own dear son (lovely child). Last of all, he was the last person he sent there to the people on the farm. I said, "I believe they will give my son respect."</p>		
	7a 7b	Kεε but	<p>anyuùnì yèmè bùñ diéñ nañ wòò nyiñ bi efèemàñ nyààñ, 'Wo jòàfèlàà kenàañ wuñ bi wεè. people look/saw farm-? upon PST saying them that among called NCP1 child-male man him that this</p>		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Ke kàbànè anyuùn yèmè wàŋ bù gbeewè jèwè dien nyàŋ (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard Mark 12:1-12 L1)	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
	7c 7d		Jiwà winùun, ké manèèŋ dààunj màŋ nòŋ weè kill let us-him then things property-his the be for us		
			But the people looking after the farm said among themselves, "This is the man's son himself. Let us kill him, so that his property will become ours (I think a possessive phrase takes a def art at the end.)		
	8abc	Kpein then	àŋ naŋ kùwò wo jàfèlàà kèènèŋ bùc yèè àŋ naunjiwè aŋ gbìàŋ e fàunj nè they PST caught NCP1 child-male owner farm-? and they him kill they threw NCP6 body-histhe NCP2 farm-? behind		
			Then they caught the farm owner's son and they killed him, they threw his body behind the farm.		
Problems Solved	9a 9b	\p	Wo Jisè naŋ nyin dawè wààŋ, "Sèe e kei kaaŋŋ yei, kiŋ wo kèènèŋ bùc do nàŋ nyenèŋ? NCP1 Jesus PST them ask saying if NCP6 things happen that what NCP1 owner farm-? will *** do		
	9cde		Wò do nàŋ hnè wo jiwà aŋ nyuùn yèmè bùc dien nyiŋ gbiŋ, e kilà wo fè woŋ bùnŋ nòŋ kobe aŋ nyuùn joo bà. he will *** come he kill person look/saw farm-? upon them all NCP6 then he give NCP2 farm-his the to NCP3-PL person differentsome		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Ke kàbànè anyùùñ yèmè wɔŋ bù gbeewè jèwè diεŋ nyàŋ (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard Mark 12:1-12 L1	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
			Jesus asked saying, "If things happen like that, what will the farm owner do?" He will come and kill all those farm overseers, then he (will) give his farm to different people.		
Closing	10a		Tɔɔbaa nàŋ wa kpènèŋ e sìnga lεɛ wɔŋ fì Dayàa sùà? Truly you used to read NCP6 writing this NCP2		
	10b		'Ke dùòe aŋ nyùunŋ nyèlε nyàŋ àŋ gò wa jàa kùàŋ dìi yε kiiŋ naŋ wa nòŋ ke duò kpene tùlià jii gbeeɛ e nyèlεɛ gbiŋ sùà. NCP4 rock NCP3-PL people build PL they not used to set hand under and it PST used to become NCP4 rock pillar put heart big NCP6 build all in		
			Truly, you have read the writing from the God book? (there may be a "you" absent from here niŋ nàŋ) The rock that the builders did not put their hand under, it has become the big rock pillar used in all building.		
	11a		Wo Kànà È Gunòŋ naŋ wa teɛ nyènèŋ. NCP1 Lord NCP6 one PST used to this do		
	11b		È yaà e kèe mèe gbee konèɛŋ wiil!" it is NCP6 thing wonderful very much to us		
			The One Lord has done this It is a very wonderful thing to us.		
	12a 12b	\p Kpeiŋ Then	aŋ kànà sièfèiŋ zòolo nyàŋ, aŋ kààmòŋ maŋ sàwà Dayà nyàŋ yè anyùùñ gbèègbèè		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Ke kàbànè anyuùn yèmè wòò bù gbeewè jèwè dièn nyàŋ (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard Mark 12:1-12 L1)	Boundary marker, Connector	Analysis
			<p>fùŋ nyàŋ naŋ kàmè dewe wèè aŋ kùwà wo Jisè, esabù àŋ wa nyimàŋ kè ke kàbanèe wò naŋ gè lε, kè nyiŋ wò sà wa.</p> <p>NCP3-PL chief leader prayer PL NCP3-PL teacher big NCP5-PL law God all of them and people big country PL PST look for way for they hold NCP1 Jesus because/reason they used to know that NCP4 parable he PST take is that them he refer used to</p> <p>àŋ dàŋ wa e faaàn, weètii àŋ nauŋ wa jòò yèè àŋ naŋ kò. they afraid used to NCP6 crowd for this they him used to left and they PST go</p>		
12def		Kεε but	<p>Then the chief priests, all the teachers of God's law and the important people of the country looked for a way to arrest Jesus because they knew that the parable he spoke that it was them he was referring to.</p> <p>But they were afraid of the crowd and for that, they left him and they went away.</p>		

Language 2

Unanalyzed texts charts

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e fàă wà yí o tèá (Jesus Calms a Storm) Mark 4:35-41 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
Setting	35ab	\p Lúó doó e kília nyéŋeipié káa, day one 3s thus evening with J	Zízè a gèe là tòà-pié-mìà lèε, Jesus 3s said his follow-behind-person-PL to		
	35c		"Kà lo yíía měí." let us go water behind		
			One day in the evening, Jesus said to his disciples, "Let us go to the other side of the water."		
	36a		O gó gbaa mia gbúa yí. They left now person-PL many in		
	36b		Zízè là tòà-pié-mìaa o yà gɔɔ lé Zízè e kε à yíá yí, Jesus his disciples 3p sit boat that Jesus he be/do it in in		
	36c		o Zízè sí gbaa, 3p Jesus take now		
	36d		o ló à ká. 3p went 3s with		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e fàà wà yíí o tèá (Jesus Calms a Storm) Mark 4:35-41 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	36e		Goo dò e ke yi kili. boat one 3s be/do in also		
			They left the group/crowd Jesus and his disciples they sat in the boat that Jesus was in. They took Jesus and carried him. Another boat was there also.		
Initial Event	37ab	Lè e ke nò kilia, And 3s be/do only then	fàà yi-gágà-zè áà dìè, wind mighty it began pass		
	37c		éé yíí áà vò, and water it began jump		
	37d		áà kàà góó yí. it pour boat in		
	37ef	Lè e ke kilia, When 3s be/do thus	góó e ke papìà gbaa yíí ká. boat 3s be/do fill now water with		
			And it happened, heavy storm began to blow, and water started jumping and entering in the boat, When this happened, the boat was getting filled with water.		
Major Problems	38a		Zízè wú-kélè e ke kpàá wú-dòà-là-pè là, Jesus head 3s be/do laying pillow over		
	38b		áà yi zè góó zízàá-pìà. 3s sleep kill boat-? back		
	38c		Wa vùò, 3p woke		
	38d		wáà gèè à lèé,		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e fàǎ wà yíí o tèá (Jesus Calms a Storm) Mark 4:35-41 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	38ef		and theysay him to "Tísè, ko kpàà wá i mò, lé kò ga bë?" teacher our care not you on and we die this		
			Jesus' head was laying on the pillow, he was sleeping at the back of the boat. They woke him, they said to him, "Teacher, don't you care for us that we are dying like this?"		
Problems Solved	39a	\p	Zízè e vuò, Jesus 3s woke		
	39b		e méis bo fàǎa lëε, 3s speak wind-? to		
	39c		áà gèè yíía lëε, 3s say water to		
	39de		"ì dò tǎǎ dñi le. you wait ground quietly ì tèá vĩ boò ká." you stop shake with		
	39fg	Lè e kε kília	fàǎa e tèá. wind-? 3s stop		
	39h	When 3s be/do thus	Éé yíía e dɔ tǎǎ gbaa dñi le. and water it wait ground now quietly		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e fàǎ wà yíí o tèá (Jesus Calms a Storm) Mark 4:35-41 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			Jesus woke and spoke to the wind and the water , "You come down quietly." You stop shaking." When this happened, the wind stopped. And the water went down quietly.		
	40a		Zízè a gèe gbaa o lèε, Jesus 3s said now them to		
	40b		"Mé e kε lé kà tùò ké be? Why 3s happened and you afraid this like		
	40c		Zò-djà-mò wá né ka yí kèé?" faith not yet you in INTER		
			Jesus said now to them, "What happened that are you now afraid? Don't you have faith yet?		
Closing	41a	\p Kεε Then	túó e nu o là gbùò, fear it came them over great		
	41b		wáà gèè o kíe nì lèε, and theysay them together-PL to		
	41c		"Dé e g̊o e kέa ká, who 3s man 3s be with		
	41d		lé fàǎ wà yíí bɛ́ ò à then wind and water also they his wè kε bɛ?"		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e fàǎ wà yíí o tèá (Jesus Calms a Storm) Mark 4:35-41 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			Then fear came on them greatly, and they said to one another, "Who is this man, then the wind and water also obey his voice?"		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e gō lé pε ycc e kε à píea la (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
Setting 1a	1a	\p	O bɔ Gálàlî Yíí-púăa mɛ̄ pà. they reach Galilee Water-big behind Gerasa- people home		
			They reached the home of the Gereasines on the other side of Lake Galilee.		
	2ab	Lè Zízè e gó nò gówá yía, And Jesus he left just boat in	gō doó e bɔ à mò. man one he reach him on		
	2c		Gó e kília, e gó bóà kóéí. man he this he left grave		
	2d		Pε ycc e kε à pié. thing bad it was him behind		
			And just as Jesus left the boat, one man met him (Jesus). This man left the grave site. A bad thing (evil spirit) was behind him.		
	3a		E kε yíipìà bóà sónó pié pié.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e gõ lé pø yø e kε à píea la (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	3b		he was sleeping grave near to to Bèi lèé gbaa kε mi gbøe mò kε á yèlè pø-kúlú bélè ká gbaa. ability itNEG ever was person any on to him tie iron rope with ever		
			He was sleeping near the graves (many so pie is repeated) No one was able to tie him with iron ropes now.		
	4a		Bii o kε à yèlèpìà pø-kúlú bélè ká à kò wà à gà mò teele. because they were him tie iron rope with his hand and his feet on always		This is not an independent clause in English. What does Bii do?
	4b	Kεε But	bélè lé e kε à kò mò, rope that it was his hand on a gáá e ká. he pull it cut		
	4c		à yé e kε à gáá mò, a mè, áà ká e kíe kélè. the one it was his foot on he beat it cut it each other hand		
	4de	Éé and	Yíkè-gááà kélè, lèé gbaa kε mi dò kélè, ke é dieá à là.		
	4fg				

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e gõ lé pø yø e kε à píea la (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			strength itNEG now was person one hand so that he pass him by		
			Because they were always tying his hands and feet with iron rope. But the rope that was around his hand, he pulled it (and) it cut. And the one that was on his foot, he beat (it), it cut from each other (in pieces). No one had strength, that he pass by him.		
	5a		E kε bóà kóéí, ẽ́ tɔ́ù wíí píea mó bíá ẽ́ nyénéí. he was grave site and mountain up all over on night and day		
	5bc		E kε gbéépià yi, áà e dìè kà gèlè ká teele. he was shouting there he kept his self cut stone with always		
			He was all over at the graves and on the mountains day and night. He was shouting there, he kept cutting himself with stones always.		
Initial Event 1	6ab	\p	E Zízè g̃e, kε e kε à ká gbèkèni. he Jesus see but he was him from far		
	6cde		E bàlà sí, e káá e kpuò là Zízè g̃a dúš.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e gõ lé pε yɔɔ e kε à píea la (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			he run take he knelt he knee over Jesus feet under		
			He sees/saw Jesus, but he(Jesus) was far from him (man). He ran, he knelt down under Jesus' feet.		
	7ab 7c		E gbéé yí-gágà-zè, áà gèè, "Zízè, lé i Wálà yé e pε séí làa Gbe káa, mé bá nàà m píé? he shout mighty he started say Jesus who you God who he thing every over son are what you looking me behind		
	7de		Mm kpékã i lèé Wálà wεlε mò, yékè í m sàd." I beg you God face on don't you me suffer		
			He shouted loudly, he started saying, "Jesus, you who are the Son of the God who is over everything, what are you looking for behind me? (Check on the two who's) I beg you before God, don't suffer me.		
Setting 1b	8a 8b 8c		Géé e kε à gèepìà kíli, bii Zízè e kε à gèepìà à lèé, "Pε yɔɔ, ì gó gõ e kéa píé." man he was he saying so because Jesus he was he saying him to thing bad you leave man he this behind		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e gõ lé pε yçç e kε à píea la (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			The man was saying this because Jesus was saying to him, "Evil spirit, you leave from behind this man." (note the pronoun before "this")		
Increasing Tension 1	9a 9b 9cd 9e	\p \p	Zízè e à wéé-lòç ke weeá kélè, "I tó lé dei?" Jesus he him questionmake saying that You name is who Gõee a gèe, "M tó lé Mia Gbū, bii ko kù lè gbùò." man he said my name is people some because we group is plenty		
			Jesus asked him that, "What is your name?" The man said, "My name is Crowd because we are many." (different tense aspect here, continued?)		
Major Problems 1	10a 10b		E kε kpó-kpobo kpé kápìà Zízè lèé, yékè é pε yçç nòç lúó lè e kília mò. he was truly beg cut Jesus to don't he thing bad them drive place it this on		
			He was really begging Jesus, so that he cannot drive those evil spirits from this place.		
Setting 1c	11a	\p	Bò kù gbùò zè dò o kε o lè bélèpìà tòúa mò kòé. pig group great that one they were they mouth eating hills on nearby		
			A big group of pigs was eating near the mountains.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e gõ lé pø yøø e kε à píea la (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
Major Problems 1 (cont.)	12abc		Pε yøø vøø o kpé ká Zízè lèø, wáà gèè, "Ko vø bò vøø píé. thing bad PL they beg cut Jesus to and theysay pig PL to		
	12d		Wéé à mò kó dà o bà." agree it on we join they in		
			The bad things begged Jesus, saying, "Send us to the pigs. Agree (on it) (that) we join them."		
Problems Solved 1	13abc	Yé e kε kília, When it happened thus	Zízè e wéé à mò ó ló yi. Jesus he agree it on they went in he gave them leave.		
	13def		Éé pε yøø vøø o gó gbaa gçéé píé, o ló gbaa, o dà bò vøø bà. and thing bad PL they left now man from they went now they fell pig PL in		
	13g		Bò vø o kε yía, o wáá e PL they was there maybe two ke thousand 3s was maybe two		
	13hi		O séé-séé o gbíí bàlà ká goo gbékënia bà. là, wáà dùò yíía		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e gõ lé pø yø e kε à píea la (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			they all they rush run with valley deep over and they throw water in		
			When it happened like this, Jesus agreed to it (and) they went in (the pigs). And the bad things left the man, they went now, they fell in the pigs. The pigs there, there were about 2 thousand. They all rushed with running over the deep valley (cliff) and they throw (themselves) in the water.		
EPISODE 2, Initial Event 2 Increasing Tension 2	14a?b 14cd 14ef	\p –	Gõà lé o kε o nyìε kεpià bò vò o kília mò, o wàà. man-PL is/was they were they eye doing pig PL they thus on they escape ÉÉ o ló, wáà wó sùu e kília dò dò pøleí, éé nyénéí kóéí píé déí le. and they went and they story such 3s thus lecture lecture town and farm area to everywhere *** A kε tó mia wáà nù wó e kε kília gée. and they come it make allow persons thus *** story 3s was		
			The men there, they (who) were watching the pigs (that went over the cliff), they escaped And they went and they such story told all over in the towns and farm areas. This made people come (to see) if such things are so.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e gɔ̃ lé pε yɔ̃ e kε à píea la (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	15ab	Lè And	o bɔ̃ Zízè mɔ̃, o gɔ̃ lé pε gbū e kε à píea gɛ. they reach Jesus on they man who thing some it was him with see		
	15c		E kε yàá yi. 3s was sitting there		
	15de		Sɔ e kε à mɔ̃, ɛɛ à Clothes it was him on gbaa sè. wū-kèlè yí e kε in it was now his head good		
	15fg	Lè e kε kília, When 3s was thus	míáa o kε túópià. people they was afraid		
			And they came to Jesus, they saw the man who had the things in him. He was sitting there. Clothes were on him and his head was now good. When it was like this, people were afraid.		
	16a		Wɔ̃ lé e kε gɔ̃ lé pε yɔ̃ e kε kpá à píea, ɛɛ wɔ̃ lé e kε bɔ̃ vò káa, mia lé wa gɛɛ, o mia à yí bo míáa lèɛ. lé wa gɛɛ, o à yí bo míáa lèɛ.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e gõ lé pε yçɔ e kε à píea la (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			Thing that it happened man that thing bad it was in the past him with and things that 3s was pig PL with persons is/was they see they it people to		
			(yi bo) means explain. The thing that happened with the man that had the bad things, and the things that happened with the pigs, the people who saw (it), they explained it to people.		
Major Problems 2	17ab 17b	Lè e kε kília, And 3s was thus	o gbɛ́, wáà kpé kǎ Zízè lèε é gó o pà. they *** and they beg cut Jesus to he leave their home		
			And it being so, they began? and they begged Jesus to leave their home.		
	18ab	Lè Zízè e kε yàpià gjóó yía, When Jesus he was *** boat in	gõ lé pε yçɔ e kε à lèε píea, áà kpé kǎ à lèε é ke Zízè píé. man that thing bad it was him with he started beg cut him to he was Jesus to		
			When Jesus he was about to get in the boat, that man with the bad things in them, he started to beg him he be with Jesus.		
Problems Solved 2	19a 19bcd	Kεε Then/but	lèé gbaa wéé à wéè mò. 3s-neg now agree him speak on Kεε a gèe gõéε lèε, "Lo i pà i mà nì píé, í zi lé i Dàa-mì àà wó keá i lèε, éé zi lé		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e gõ lé pe yoo e ke à píea la (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			aà i yéè kú à káa, yí bo o lèe." but he said man to Go your home your people PL to you way that your Lord he things *** you to and way that he you *** held him with in they to		
			But he did not agree ??? But he said to the man, "Go to your home to your people, ?the way/how the Lord has done things to you and the way the showed mercy , you tell them.?".		
Closing	20abcdef	\p Yé e ke kília, And it was thus	gõee e wèlè gbaa, lè e ló lè lè o ke à sipià Péle Vù Doóa yí, áà lò wò lè Zízè a ke à lèe, gèèá sí mia lèe. man 3s get up now that 3s went and that they was it calling *** *** *** in he started go story that Jesus he was him to *** take persons to mia lè o wò e kília maa, o séí o lè kpó-kpó e pa. persons that they story 3s thus heard they every they mouth truly 3s ***		
			And it being so, the man got up now, and he went and when he was in the place they call the 10 towns, he started telling people what Jesus did for him. (?)And the people that heard		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e gõ lé pø yøø e kε à píea la (Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits) Mark 5:1-20 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			the story, all of them their mouth truly ??? (they were amazed)		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e lúà kpó nòòbé mò (Jesus Blesses Little Children) Mark 10:13-16 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
Setting Initial Event	13a	\p	Mia o kε nupìà nòòbé ká Zízè pié, persons 3p be/do coming children with Jesus to		
	13b		kε é pá o mò. so that he touch them on		
	13c	Kεε but	là tòà-pié-mìàa wa gèe míáa lèε yékè ó kε kíli. his disciples 3p said people to not 3p		
			People were coming with children to Jesus so that he bless them. But his disciples said to the people that they should not do so.		
Major Problems Problems Solved	14ab	Lè Zízè e w᷑ e kε kεpiàa yí dcp, When Jesus 3s things 3s be/do happening in	w᷑ a wàa, thing 3s anger		
	14c		áà gèè là tòà-pié-mìàa lèε, 3s say his disciples to		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e lúà kpó nòòbé mò (Jesus Blesses Little Children) Mark 10:13-16 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	14de		<p>"Kà tó nòòbáea ó nu m pié. You allow children they came 1s to</p> <p>Yékè ká o téá nuù mò. not YouPL them stop come on</p>		
	14f		<p>Bii mia sùu o kéra, for persons such 3p be</p>		
	14g		<p>Wálà lèè lo tóò o là. God he will remain them over</p>		
			When Jesus saw the thing that was happening, it made him angry, he he said to his disciples, "You allow the children to come to me. Don't stop them from coming. For such people like this God will remain over them."		
Closing	15ab	Wánà-wò gèe bè. truth-thing said this	<p>lé ka mò is/was I you to</p> <p>Mi lé lèé ló wéè à mò, person who 3s-neg agree speak it on</p>		
	15c		<p>lè zí néfú è wèè à ká à mò, like how child 3s accept it with it on</p> <p>ké Wálà é tó à làà lè so that God he remain him over and? like</p>		
	15d		<p>Wálà lèé ló tóò à là gbeè bo." God 3s-neg went remain 3s over no more</p>		
	15e				

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Zízè e lúà kpó nòòbé mò (Jesus Blesses Little Children) Mark 10:13-16 L2	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			True thing it is I am saying to you. Any person who does not agree on this, and accept it like a child accepts it, so that God can remain over him like it, God will not remain over that person anymore.		
	16ab	Yé e kε when 3s be/do thus	e e kò s᷑ nòòbéa mò, he his hand cover children on		
	16b		éé e e kò kpó o là doó and he his hand lay them over one		
	16c		áà lúà kpò o mò. he blessing put them on		
			When this happened, he gathered the children and laid his hands over each one and put blessing on them.		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Piã lé à gbɛɛ̄ lε mia lé o kε o nyìε kεpià nyénɛ̄ mòɔ mòɔ (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard) Mark 12:1-12	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
Setting	1ab 1c	\p	Zízè e gbɛ̄ gbaa, áà piã vò o lèε weeá kélè, "Gō doó e bɛlè- wéíé lé ò à bεε yíí mia Jesus he started now he started parable say them to saying that		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Pià lé à gbèè lè mia lé o kε o nyìe kεpià nyénèè mòc mòc (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard) Mark 12:1-12	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	1d		E he gàlà fence bo made à it mò. on		
	1e		E he gùlù hole dò one taa-pè planting e thing ká kilia lè bëe s. mò. dug which place lè bëe yíí fruit mò. where boò they will squeeze it place on at		
	1f		E he kàmà watchtower bo. made		
	1gh	Yé when e it kília, so kε was	e he ló went gbaa now táá journey mò on lè place mò. far gbèkèni on		
			Jesus started now, he started saying a parable to them saying that, "One man made a vinyard -(with)- fruit- they- can- drink farm. He made a fence on it. He dug a whole where they will squeeze the plant water (?). He made a watchtower. When it was so, he went on a journey to a far place.		
Initial Event	2ab	Lè lé taa-pè e kília tãä-lùò e bɔc,	gòe e là lùò doó vɔ mia lé o kε o nyìe kεpià nyénèè mòc píé, kεs ó taa-pè e kília bëe dò vɔ à lè.		
	2c				

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Pià lè à gbèè lè mia lè o kè o nyè kəpià nyénèè mòò mòò (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard) Mark 12:1-12	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
		And that planting thing which that planting-day which arrive	man he his servant one send personthat they was They eye doing farm-that on to then they planting thing 3s that fruit some send him for		
			And when the fruit was ready to harvest (sic text says planting time kaa-luo), the man sent a servant to those watching the farm , (that) then they send some fruit to him.		
Increasing Tension	3abc		O lùò e kília kú, wa mè, wa vɔ e mèí e kò fèle ká. They servant which that hold they beat empty with		
			They caught the servant, they beat (him?), they send him back with empty hand.		
	4a		Góεe e lùò doó-mì vɔ zeí o píé. man 3s servant another send again them to		
	4bc		Wa gíí e wū-kèlè yí, wáà kè e líà-bo-zì píé. they wound his head in and they do it disgrace to		
			The man he another worker sent again to them. They wounded him on his head, and they do it in a disgraceful way. (the it refers back to the action)		
	5a		Góεe e lùò doó-mì vɔ zeí. man he servant another send again		
	5b		À yee wa zé. him for they kill		
	5c				

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Pià lé à gbèè lè mia lé o kε o nyìe kεpià nyénèi mòc mòc (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard) Mark 12:1-12	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	5d 5ef		O wó nò doóá kε lùò vò búnùzè ká. they Business just same did servant sent O o dò mè, wáà o dò zè. they them some beat and they them some kill		
			The man sent another servant again. That one they killed. They did the same with many servants (that were) sent. They beat some and they killed some.		
Major Problems	6a 6b 6c 6d		Mi doó tòò e kε tiá à ká gőee kélè. person one remain he was still his with Mía lé e tó là lò-kéá-nè. person that he remain his beloved-child Yé e kε nò kília, e à vò o pié. when it was just so he him send Gőee a gée kélè, 'Óò lo bèleýà nò m gbéa lè.' man he said that They will respect give my son to		
			One person remained, he was still with the man's hand. (a is referring to the master) That person he was the beloved child. When it happened so, he sent him to them. The man he said that, They will give respect to my son.		
	7a	Kεε Then	mia lé o kε o nyìe kεpià nyénèi e kília mòc, wa gée o		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Pià lè à gbèè lè mia lè o kε o nyiè kεpià nyénèè mòò mòò (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard) Mark 12:1-12	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	7b 7c		<p>kíe nì lè, 'Mí à dàa là còò è lo tóò à kèlèè, lè e kéa.</p> <p>person that they was they eye doing farm which that on they said they one another to person his father over things it will remain his hand that one he be</p> <p>Kòà ze wè. *** kill ***</p> <p>pé è lo tóò à kèlèè, lèè lo kεè *** kòà pε ká gbaa.' *** he will remain it hand he will *** thing with now</p>		
	7de	Yé aà kε when it? be thus	Then those people they (who) were watching the farm as such, they said to each other, "this person (who) will inherit all the things in his father's hand, that is the one. Let's kill him. When it was so (when it happened) (the inheritance will be ours???????)		
	8abc 8d	Yé e kε When it be so	<p>wa kú, wa ze. they held they kill</p> <p>Éé o gó à ká nyénèè mò. and they left it with farm-that on</p>		
			When it was so, they caught (him?), they killed (him?). And they removed him from the farm.		
Problems Solved	9a	\p	"Nyénèè kília dàa-mì lèè lo gbaa à kεè kpe ?		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Pià lé à gbèè lè mia lé o kε o nyìe kεpià nyénèi mòò mòò (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard) Mark 12:1-12	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
	9bc		farm he thus father he will now it *** *** nuù, tó e mia lé o kília he will come and he personthat they thus them kill		
	9de		Léè io o zε, he will thus come them kill		
			tó e nyénèia sí, a dò nyìe kε mia gbèè kélè ó o nyìe kε and he farm-? take they he *** was personsany hand they they eye was it on		
			What then will that farm lord do now? He will come, and he (will) kill those persons that are there, and he (will) take the farm (he will give it any people they will watch it?).		
Closing	10a		Kàá Wálà kii lè yé e kέá gée do? *** God book like when 3s this said		
	10b		Ye lé e kélè, When is/was it that		
	10c		'Gélè lé mèia, ká dò-mìà wa dà o kò stone that with build-person they fell they hand ***		
			aà kε dieá gbaa gélè kpànazè ká, é it be/do now stone every over with it pass stone		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Pià lé à gbèè lè mia lé o kε o nyìe kεpià nyénèi mòò mòò (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard) Mark 12:1-12	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			(Do you know what God's book says??)?? When it says, That stone the building people threw from their hand). it is now the greatest? stone, it passes all stones.		
	11ab		Wò e kέá, ko Dàa-mì lé e à kεε. Thing it be we Lord that 3s it make		
	11b		Lé wó kpàlézéká ko lèé. and things *** with we to		
			The thing it happened, our lord he did it. And it is amazing to us.		
	12a		Mia lé Zízé e kε wò gèepià o naapià ó lèé, o kε à wò kε-zì saying they kú. people that to they held		
	12b		Bii wa yí vòò dò lè kélè pià gbí a vòò, à vòò they in he build *** that parable he *** on		
	12c	Kεε but	mia kù kè yí gbùòà, o kε à móò móò túó do in *** they was personsgroup it *** fear ***		
	12de		o ká gbaa Zízé lèé, wáà wà ló they cut now Jesus to *** and they		

Pattern of the story	Number	Connectors	Piâ lè à gbɛɛ lè mia lè o kε o nyiε kεpià nyénɛi mòc mòc (The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard) Mark 12:1-12	Boundary marker, connector	Analysis
			Those people Jesus was saying the story to them, they were trying? they arrest (him). Because they knew that parable he told, he told against them. But people group (there?) they were afraid of it. They left Jesus now and they went.		

APPENDIX C

ASSIGNMENTS – NARRATIVE DISCOURSE WORKSHOP

ANALYSIS 1 (Communication Situation):

Today you will begin a write-up for your natural story that you will add to as you do each day's assignment. Begin your write-up in a new file on your computer (or a new page in your notebook). For today's write-up, put the heading "Communication Situation". In your write-up, mention your language name and dialect (if any); tell who was the author (name and approximate age) of your story, to whom the story was told and why the story was told; is this a written or oral story? Write a 1-2 sentence summary of what the story is about; tell whether you have permission to analyze the story and report what you learn to others.

ANALYSIS 2 (Pattern of a Story):

- 1) Look for an Opening and a Setting in your story. If your story has one or both of these sections, write either "Opening" or "Setting" in the Pattern column to the left of the first sentence of the section.
- 2) In the Analysis column tell whether this is a true story or a traditional story, and tell how you decided which type of story it is.
- 3) WRITE-UP (Pattern of a Story): If your story has a title, tell how the title was chosen. If your story has an
Opening, tell what is in the Opening— Does the Opening tell what the story is about? Does the Opening tell who is the author? Is there a genealogy? Does the author show in some way that it is a true story or a traditional story?
 - If your story has a Setting, tell in your write-up what information is given. (Tell how the story answers any of these questions: When did it happen? Who was there? Where did it take place? What was happening?)
 - Tell how your story shows whether it is a true story or a traditional story.

ANALYSIS 3:

- 1) Look for an Initial Event, a Developing Conflict or Increasing Tension, and Major Problems in your natural story. You should have an Initial Event and Major Problems. Your story might or might not have Developing Conflict or Increasing Tension.
- 2) Write either "Initial Event," "Developing Conflict" or "Increasing Tension," or "Major Problems" in the Pattern column to the left of the first sentence of the section.

ANALYSIS 4:

- 1) Look for the Problems Solved section in your story, and write "Problems Solved" in the Pattern column to the left of the first sentence of the Problems Solved section.
- 2) If there is a Closing after the Problems Solved section, write "Closing" in the Pattern column to the left of the first sentence of the Closing section.
- 3) If there is a Finish at the end of your story, write "Finish" in the Pattern column.

ANALYSIS 5 (Oral and Written Style): Tell what you have learned about oral and written style for your translation.

ANALYSIS 6 (Talking about the People in a Story): Look at the natural story in your language. Answer the "Finding the Main Character..." questions below at the end of your story. Tell who are the main character and secondary participants in your natural story.

Finding the Main Character and Secondary Participants

1. Who is in the story from the beginning of the story to the end?
2. Who is quoted directly?
3. Who gives a command?
4. Who thinks about a situation and decides what needs to be done?

5. Who judges others in the story? [Who decides that someone's behaviour is good or bad or decides that someone is doing the right thing or doing the wrong thing?]
6. Who solves the problem?
7. To whom are the other participants responding?
8. With whom does the narrator sympathize? [Is there anywhere in the story where the author tells how a participant feels? Does the author cause you to like or care about one of the participants more than the others?]

The one who was named most often in answer to the above questions is the 'Main character'. Others who are named are Secondary Participant 1, Secondary Participant 2... Minor participants are usually not mentioned in answering these questions.

ANALYSIS 7:

WRITE-UP (Talking about the People in a Story):

- 1) Make a list of the participants in the story, beginning with the main character and ending with the least important.
- 2) Tell why you consider the main character to be the most important participant in the story.
- 3) Tell who the minor participants are and who or what are the most important props.

ANALYSIS 8:

- 1) At the top of the chart of your natural story list the main character and the secondary participants, using a different color for each one.
- 2) Go through your story and mark the main character and the secondary participants in the color that you have chosen for each one. Don't color-code them if they are mentioned within a direct or indirect quotation. [You are doing this in order to see how the author keeps track of participants as the story moves along.]
- 3) If a participant is obviously present in a sentence but is not referred to overtly at all (no noun or name, no pronoun or other marker, no verb ending), put a "null" symbol, ø, in the place in the sentence where you would expect that person to be referred to, if there had been a reference.

ANALYSIS 9:

- 1) Using questions A) to D) below, look at how each participant is introduced in your story the first time that they are mentioned. Put your observations in the Analysis column.
 - A) Which participants are introduced with the word 'one' or 'a certain'? Tell if each one is the main character, a secondary participant or a minor participant.
 - B) Is the main character introduced before he or she does anything in the story? Is a secondary participant introduced before he or she does anything in the story? If the answer to either of these questions is "Yes," tell how that participant is introduced.
 - C) Is the main character introduced with more words than other participants? If so, tell how the main character is introduced.
 - D) Is there a certain position in the sentence where new participants are introduced, possibly after the verb?
- 2) WRITE-UP: Discuss "How participants are introduced," by telling your answers to questions A) to D) above.
- 3) **Translation Application:** Look at Mark 5:2 in your language. Is the man possessed by a demon introduced in a similar way to the way the most important secondary participant is introduced in your natural story?
Should he be introduced with "one" or "a certain"? Should he be introduced with both a noun phrase and a pronoun? **Make any changes that you decide are needed in your translation of Mark 5:2.**
- 4) **WRITE-UP - Translation Application:** Tell what you have learned about introducing participants in your translation of Bible stories. If you are already introducing participants in a natural way, mention in your Write-up how you are introducing them.

ANALYSIS 10:

- 1) Look at how people are referred to in your natural story. Is the main character referred to by name or in some other way? Are any of the participants referred to by their role (what they do) or by their relationship to the main character.
- 2) WRITE-UP: If the main character in your story is referred to by name, while some other participants are referred to by their role or their relationship to the main character, tell in your write-up who is referred to in which way.

ANALYSIS 11:

- 1) Look at how the main character is referred to in your natural story. Is the main character referred to by just a pronoun whenever it is possible?
- 2) Or is the main character referred to with a pronoun or a null reference more often when he is a victim, and by name or noun phrase when he is in control of the situation?
- 3) WRITE-UP: Tell what you have found when you answered these questions.

ANALYSIS 12:

- 1) In your natural story, each time a participant is mentioned with their name or a noun or noun phrase, is there also a pronoun? Or is a pronoun used with a name or noun or noun phrase only when the person is the agent (the one who does something in the sentence)?
- 2) WRITE-UP: Tell what you have observed about using a pronoun when a person is referred to with their name or a noun or a noun phrase.
- 3) Color-code Jesus (the main character) and the man with evil spirits (Secondary Participant 1) in your translation of Mark 5:1-20 in the same way that you color-coded the two most important participants in your natural story.
- 4) Read what you have written in your write-up about how the participants are referred to.
- 5) Look at how Jesus is referred to in Mark 5:1-20, to see if he is mentioned in the same way as the main character in your natural story. Do you need to make any changes?
- 6) Look at how the man with evil spirits is referred to in Mark 5:1-20, to see if he is mentioned in the same way as Secondary Participant 1 in your natural story. Do you need to make any changes?
- 7) WRITE-UP – Translation Application: If you have made changes in your translation of Mark 5:1-20, tell what changes you have made and why you made them.

ANALYSIS 13:

- 1) Look for a passive verb or a way of keeping the focus on an important participant, as in the "Waante" story.
- 2) If you find a passive verb or a similar method of keeping the focus on an important participant, show it in your WRITE-UP.

ANALYSIS 14:

- 1) Look in your natural story to see if there are any places where a name or a noun phrase referring to the main character or a secondary participant is used instead of 'his,' 'her,' or 'their'.
Why is it used in that place in the story? In your translation of Mark 5:29 would it be better in your language to say "She touched Jesus' cloak," since it's an important event in the story?
- 2) WRITE-UP: Tell what you have learned about words that show possession in a story.

ANALYSIS 15 (Showing Respect):

WRITE-UP (Showing Respect): In your write-up, tell what you know about showing respect in your language, and how it affects your translation of Bible stories.

ANALYSIS 16 (Reporting Speech):

- 1) Look for direct quotations in your natural story. Color code each of them yellow, and write 'Direct Quote' in the 'Analysis of Quotes' column.
- 2) If your story has any semi-direct quotes, color-code them green, and write 'Semi-direct quote' in the 'Analysis of Quotes' column.
- 3) If your story has any indirect quotes, color-code them blue, and write 'Indirect quote' in the 'Analysis of Quotes' column.

- 4) Color-code the quote formulas grey in your natural story.
- 5) Tell in the 'Analysis of Quotes' column what is in the quote formula: 'Speaker & speech verb,' 'Speaker, listener & speech verb'
 - If there is no speech verb, write 'no speech verb.'
 - If there is no quote formula, write 'drama'
- 6) Repeat Steps 1) to 5) above with your translation of the story of the demon-possessed man (Mark 5:1-20).

ANALYSIS 17:

- 1) Using the information from your analysis of the quotations and quote formulas in your story and your translation of the Bible story of the demon-possessed man, make a table to compare how speech is reported in the two stories.
- 2) Write your Observations and Translation Applications under the table.

Table 1: Comparison of information in quote formulas in natural [language name] story with a Bible story

	Natural story "_____"	Translated Bible story, Mark 5:1-20 "Demon-possessed Man"
<u>Number and types of quotations</u>	Direct quotes Semi-direct quotes <u>Indirect quotes</u> TOTAL	Direct quotes Semi-direct quotes <u>Indirect quotes</u> TOTAL
<u>Quote Formulas</u>	No quote formula () Speaker only, no speech word () Speaker + speech word () Speaker + <i>listener</i> + speech word ()	No quote formula () Speaker only, no speech word () Speaker + speech word () Speaker + <i>listener</i> + speech word ()

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

- 3) **WRITE-UP** (Reporting Speech): Include your table with your Observations and Translation Applications in your write-up.

ANALYSIS 18 (Peak of the Story):

- 1) Look for the Peak features that we have just discussed in the Major Problems section and the Problems Solved section of your natural story.
 - Exact repetition – saying exactly the same things as had been said before
 - Repeated actions – doing the same thing again
- 2) Write the features that you find in the Analysis column, with the sentence number.
- 3) Look for these features in the Initial Event and other parts of your story, and mention them in the Analysis column with the sentence number.

ANALYSIS 19:

- 1) Look for the Peak features that we have just discussed in the Major Problems section and the Problems Solved section of your natural story.
 - Paraphrase – saying the same thing in a different way
 - General-specific or Specific-General – A general statement followed by specific examples or specific examples followed by a general statement.
 - Short-Long or Long-short – Telling about something in a few words and also telling about the same thing with more details.
- 2) Write the features that you find in the Analysis column, with the sentence number.
- 3) Look for these features in the Initial Event and other parts of your story, and mention them in the Analysis column with the sentence number.

ANALYSIS 20:

- 1) Look for parallelism in the Major Problems section and the Problems Solved section of your natural story.

Parallelism – two sentences or parts of sentences have similar structures and ideas.

- 2) If you find any parallelism in your story, write “Parallelism” and the sentence number(s) in the Analysis column.
- 3) Look for parallelism in the Initial Event and in the rest of your story. If you find it, write “Parallelism” and the sentence numbers in the Analysis column.
- 4) **Translation Application:** Look at your translation of Mark 4:39. Is there parallelism in your translation? Could it be made more parallel to make it easier to read and to remember?
WRITE-UP (Peak of a Story): Tell what you have observed about parallelism in your translation of Mark 4:39.

ANALYSIS 21:

- 1) Look for a burger structure or an X structure in the Major Problems section and the Problems Solved section of your natural story.
 - Burger structure – the same or similar phrases or clauses at the beginning and the end of the peak or of a paragraph within the peak. (Sometimes there is a burger structure at the beginning and end of a story.)
 - X structure - The first part is similar to the last part, the second part is similar to the next to last part, etc.
- 2) If you find a burger structure or an X structure, write “Burger structure” or “X structure” and the Sentence number(s) in the Analysis column.
- 3) Look for a burger structure or an X structure in the Initial Event and in the rest of your story. If you find either one, write “Burger structure” or “X structure” and the sentence numbers in the Analysis column.

ANALYSIS 22:

- 1) Look for tail-head connections in your natural story (places where the end of one sentence is similar to the beginning of another sentence). If you find any, mention them in the Analysis column.
Tell whether they are:
 - a) drawing attention to something important,
 - b) marking the beginning of the Initial Event, Major Problems or Problems Solved sections
 - c) marking the beginning of a paragraph, and/or
 - d) there are tail-head connections in two or more sentences in a row to slow the story down and make people wonder what is going to happen.
- 2) Look for tail-tail connections in your natural story (places where the beginning of one sentence is similar to the beginning of another sentence). If you find any, mention them in the Analysis column.
- 3) Look for head-head connections in your natural story. If you find any, mention them in the Analysis column.

ANALYSIS 23:

- 1) Look for contrast (two opposite statements) in the Peak(s) of your natural story. If you find any, write “Contrast” with the sentence number(s) in the Analysis column.
- 2) Look for null references to the main character or a secondary participant in the Peak(s) of your natural story. If you find any, write “null reference to [name of participant]” with the sentence number(s) in the Analysis column.
- 3) Look in the Peak(s) of your natural story to see if the main character is mentioned more often by name or noun phrase than in the other parts of the story. If this is true, write “Main character mentioned more often by name [or noun phrase] in Peak”.

ANALYSIS 24:

- 1) Look for rhetorical questions in the Peak(s) of your natural story. If you find any, write “Rhetorical question” with the sentence number(s) in the Analysis column.
- 2) Look in the Peak(s) of your natural story to see if there are any questions that are followed by an answer that is a complete sentence. If you find any, write “Question followed by an answer that is a complete sentence” with the sentence number(s) in the Analysis column.
- 3) Look at how you translated the rhetorical question in Mark 4:38, “Teacher, don’t you care that we are about to die?” Does the rhetorical question sound natural to you?

ANALYSIS 25:

- 1) Look for a change in orientation (victim becomes aggressor or the persecutor or aggressor becomes the victim). If you find a change, mention it in the Analysis column.
- 2) Compare the connectors before the Peak with the connectors at the Peak of your natural story to see if there are fewer connecting words or more connectors at the Peak of your natural story. If there are, mention it in the Analysis column.
- 3) If there is a shorter or longer sentence, paragraph, or quotation, mention it in the Analysis column.

ANALYSIS 26:

- 1) Look in your natural story for vivid language, exclamations and figures of speech, and mention them in the Analysis column.
- 2) **Translation Application:** Vivid language should be used in your translation of Mark 5:6-13. Look at your translation to see if you have used natural-sounding vivid language, or if you think these verses should be made more noticeable and exciting. Make any changes that you think are needed.
- 3) **WRITE-UP - Translation Application:** Tell what vivid language you used in your translation of Mark 5:6-13. If you have added or changed any vivid language in these verses, tell what change(s) you made and why.

ANALYSIS 27:

- 1) Look for super words in your natural story. If you find any, mention the word and sentence number in your Analysis column.
- 2) Are any of the sentences with super words also exaggeration? If so, mention it in the Analysis column.

ANALYSIS 28:

- 1) Make a table to compare where the quotations are in your natural story (Setting, Initial Event, Increasing Tension, Major Problems, Problems Solved, Closing) and in your translation of Mark 5:1-20 and tell what type of quotations are in each section (Indirect, semi-direct, direct):

Table 2: Location of quotations

	Natural Story	Mark 5:1-20
Setting		
Initial Event		
Increasing Tension		
Major problems		
Problems solved		
Closing		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

- 2) In your Observations below the table, include what you find in answer to these instructions and questions:
 - Compare the types of quotations in the sections of your natural story with the types of quotations in the sections of your translation of Mark 5:1-20.
 - Where are the quotations in your natural story and in your Bible story?
 - Are the types of quotations used in each section approximately the same, especially the types of quotations used in the Major Problems, Problems Solved and Initial Event section? If not, what differences do you see?
- 3) **WRITE-UP – Translation Application:** Show your table with the types of quotations you have found in the different sections of your story. Include your Observations and Translation Applications. Tell what you have learned about types of quotations to use in different sections of a translated Bible story.
- 4) **Translation Application:** Make any changes that you think are needed to improve the

way quotations are shown in your translation of Mark 5:1-20.

- 5) **WRITE-UP - Translation Application:** If you have added or changed any of the quotations in your translation of Mark 5:6-13, tell what change(s) you made and why.

REMEMBER: You are comparing only one natural story with one Bible story. You need to look at more natural stories to see what types of quotations are used and where they are used.

ANALYSIS 29:

- 1) When you analyzed your natural story, did you find any quote formulas that did not have a verb? If you did, look to see if the quotation is in the Initial Event, the Major Problems, or the Problems Solved section. If it occurs in one of these sections more than in other sections, it is a prominence marker (in the Initial Event) or a peak-marker.
- 2) When you analyzed your natural story, did you find any quotation that did not have a quote formula (drama)? If you did, look to see if the quotation is in the Initial Event, the Major Problems, or the Problems Solved section. If it is in one of these sections it is a prominence marker (in the Initial Event) or a peak-marker.
- 3) If you have found either of these peak-marking features, write 'No verb in quote formula' or 'Drama' in the Analysis column with the sentence number.
- 4) **Translation Application:** If you need to remove a speech verb or a quote formula to draw attention to a quotation in a Peak in your translation of Mark 5:1-20, make that change.
- 5) **WRITE-UP - Translation Application:** If you have made either of these changes in your translation in Mark 5:1-20, tell in your write-up what change you have made and why.

ANALYSIS 30:

- 1) Look in the Major Problems and the Problems Solved sections of your natural text for ideophones, "like this" or "like that," or other peak-marking words. If you find any, mention them in the Analysis column with the sentence number.

ANALYSIS 31:

- 1) Using the list of Peak-marking Features in the Summary page for this handout, check to see if you have found all of the peak-marking features in your natural story and written them in the Analysis column. *You need to look for peak-marking features in all of the sections of your natural story, because many of them are also theme-marking features.*
- 2) Look for peak-marking features in your translation of Mark 5:1-20, as you have just done for your natural story in ANALYSIS 18 to ANALYSIS 27 and ANALYSIS 30 (above), and write them in the Analysis column. Remember that peak-marking features might be in other parts of the story, as well as in the Initial Event and the Peak (Major Problems and/or Problems Solved sections). If they are actually peak-marking features, they will appear more often or less often in the Peak than in other sections. *You need to look for peak-marking features in all of the sections of your translation of Mark 5:1-20, because many of them are also theme-marking features.*
- 3) **TIP:** *As you look for features of the peak, you may find that you will need to shift the placement of the beginning or the end of the Major Problems section or the Problems Solved section.* (For example, the Major Problems section might begin one sentence earlier than you thought.)
- 4) Determine where the peak of each episode in your story occurs--the part of the story that is told differently than the rest of the story, the part with more peak-marking. It may be in the Major Problems, the Problems Solved section, or both. Sometimes—but not very often—the Closing is included in the Peak of a story. At the beginning of each Peak, write 'PEAK' and the Sentence Numbers of the Peak in the Analysis column.
- 5) If your story has more than one episode, determine which episode has the most peak-marking features. This is the most prominent peak of the story. Write 'Peak Episode' at the beginning of this episode, in the Analysis column.
- 6) Make a table in which you compare the peak-marking features in your natural story with the peak-marking features in your translation of Mark 5:1-20.

**Table 3: Comparison of Peak-marking Features in a Natural Story
and a Translated Bible Story**

Peak-marking in Story	Peak-marking in Mark 5: 1-20,

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

- 7) Underline any features that are found in one column of the chart, but not in the other.
- 8) Compare the types of peak-markers in the two stories and write your Observations and Translation Applications beneath the table.
- 9) **WRITE-UP:** Include your table and Observations and Translation Applications in your Write-up. Tell how you can use what you have learned about Peak-marking in your translation of Bible stories.
- 10) **Translation Application:** Make any changes that you think are needed in the peak-marking and marking the Initial Events in Mark 5:1-20.
- 11) **WRITE-UP - Translation Application:** If you have made any changes in your translation of Mark 5:1-20, tell in your write-up what changes you made and why you made them.

ANALYSIS 32 (Theme):

- 1) If you are doing your analysis on a computer, rename the file with your natural story. Include "Theme, boundaries, and connectors" in the file name, in place of Participants, Speech, Peak. Name the column to the left of your Analysis column "Type of Boundary Marker or Connector." Delete any information that is in this column.
If you are doing your analysis on paper, use the copy of your natural text and the copy of your translated Bible stories that say "Theme, Boundaries, and Connectors" at the top of the first page.
- 2) Look in each of the following places in your natural story to see if the theme of the story or of an episode is given there:
 - Title
 - Opening
 - Closing or end of Problems Solved section
 - Peak
- 3) If you find the theme given in any of these places, write in your Analysis column where the theme is mentioned and how it is stated--If possible, quote the theme from the story, but a summary statement is also acceptable.
- 4) If the theme is not stated in any of these sections, write the theme that you see in the story in the Analysis column.
- 5) **WRITE-UP (Theme):** Tell what the theme of your story and of each episode is. If the theme is stated in the story or in an episode, tell where you found it (sentence number(s)).

ANALYSIS 33:

- 1) **WRITE-UP - Translation Application:** Tell what you have decided about choosing section headings for Bible stories in your language.
- 2) **WRITE-UP - Translation Application:** Tell what section headings you are using for the story of Jesus calming the storm in Mark 4: 35-41, the story about Jesus and the man with an evil spirit in Mark 5:1-20 and the parable about the tenants in the vineyard in Mark 12:1-12.

ANALYSIS 34:

- 1) Is there a topic group in your natural story that is related to the theme?
- 2) In the Analysis column tell what the topic is and the things mentioned in the story that are in that topic group.

ANALYSIS 35:

- 1) You may have already found repeated words and vivid language in your natural story, when you were looking for peak-marking. If you have mentioned these features on your "Participants, speech, peak" chart, look to see if they are also being used to *state* the theme of your story, or to *develop* the theme. If they are, write "repeated words" or "vivid language" in the Analysis column, wherever they are showing the theme,
- 2) Copy the repeated words or vivid language into the Analysis column of your "Theme, boundaries, connectors" chart.

ANALYSIS 36:

- 1) Look at the information in the quotations in your natural story for information that states or develops the theme of your natural story or of an episode of your natural story. Tell in the Analysis column what you have found.
- 2) Look at the information after tail-head connections in your natural story, to see if it states the theme.
- 3) Write-up: Tell whether you have found information in quotations that tells about the theme of your natural story. Give examples.
- 4) Write-up: Tell if you have found information about the theme after any tail-head connections.

ANALYSIS 37:

- 1) Look at your translation of Mark 5:19 and compare it with Mark 5:20. Does your translation have enough parallelism between the verses to help people remember the theme?
- Translation Application:** If you need to make any changes in Mark 5:19, 20 to make them sound more similar, so that the theme will be easier to remember, do so.
- 2) **WRITE-UP - Translation Application:** Tell the theme of Mark 5:1-20 is, and tell how you have translated Mark 5:19,20.

ANALYSIS 38:

- 1) Look for **theme**-marking in your translation of Mark 4:41. Is the language vivid enough to draw attention to the theme? Is it acceptable to use a rhetorical question, or do you need to change it? Is it acceptable in your language to say that the wind and the waves obey Jesus, or do you need to say it in one of the other ways that are suggested in Translators Notes? If you need to change any of these things, mention it in the Analysis column.
- 2) If you need to make changes in your translation, revise the verse.
- 3) **WRITE-UP - Translation Application:** If you have made any changes in your translation of Mark 4:41, show what the verse said before and after the changes. Tell why you made changes.

ANALYSIS 39:

- 1) Look at the peak-marking features that you have identified in the Analysis column in your natural story.
If you are doing your analysis on paper, copy the peak-marking features in the Analysis column on your first copy of your natural story that are also theme-marking features onto the chart of your story on which you are analyzing the theme.
If you are doing your analysis on your computer, and some peak-marking features are not theme-marking features, delete them from the Analysis column. If there is any other information in the Analysis column that is not related to theme-marking, boundaries or connectors, delete it from the Analysis column. You may, for example, have information on participant reference that is not needed on this copy of your chart.
- 2) If you find any other theme-marking features, mention them in the Analysis column.

ANALYSIS 40:

- 1) **WRITE-UP (Theme of natural story):** Re-write the theme for your natural story which you have already mentioned in your write-up, if needed. Then be sure that the theme-markers that show that this is the theme are all listed in the Analysis column.
- 2) **WRITE-UP – Translation Application (Theme of “Jesus Calms a Storm):** Write the theme of the story (the quotation in Mark 4:41) in the Analysis column. Be sure that all of the

theme-markers are listed in the Analysis column. (You already found many of them when you looked for Peak-marking.) Put any changes that would make the theme more obvious and easier to remember into your translation, and show the changed verse(s) in your write-up.

3) WRITE-UP – Translation Application (Theme of “Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits”)

Spirits”: Write the theme for your translation of Mark 5:1-20 by quoting as much of theme as you can from your translation of verses 19 and 20. Be sure that all of the theme-markers are listed in the Analysis column. Put any changes that would make the theme more obvious and easier to remember into your translation, and show the changed verses in your write-up.

4) WRITE-UP – Translation Application (Theme of “Jesus Blesses the Little Children”)

Tell how you have translated the quotation in Mark 10:14c-f,15, which is the theme of the story. Be sure that all of the theme-markers are listed in the Analysis column. Put any changes that would make the theme more obvious and easier to remember into your translation, and show the changed verse(s) in your write-up.

5) WRITE-UP – Translation Application (Theme of “The Parable of the Tenants in the Vineyard”)

Vineyard”: Tell how you have translated Mark 12:10-12, which is the theme of the story. Be sure that all of the theme-markers are listed in the Analysis column. Put any changes that would make the theme more obvious and easier to remember into your translation, and show the changed verse(s) in your write-up.

6) WRITE-UP – Translation Application: Tell what you have learned about theme-marking in your language that will help you in translating Bible stories. These questions may help you:

- Will you need to sometimes add the theme in the Opening or Closing of a Bible story?
- How will you translate “I tell you” or a similar theme-marking expression into your language?
- What have you learned about translating vivid language?
- Will you need to change some parallel structures into X structures in your translation?
- Will tail-head connections need to be added to some of your translated stories, to draw attention to the theme of a Bible story?
- What other kinds of changes did you make to better show the theme?

ANALYSIS 41 (Boundaries and Boundary Marking):

1) Look in verses 18-20 of your translation of the story of the man with evil spirits in Mark 5. Is it just one paragraph or more than one paragraph? Do you think that your choice of paragraph boundaries helps people to understand the theme of the story? Do you need to make any changes in paragraph boundaries in those verses? (It's OK to say, "No.")

2) Translation Application: Make any change that you think is needed in your paragraph boundaries in Mark 5:18-20.

3) WRITE-UP – Translation Application: Tell how making the theme clear affects your choice of paragraph boundaries in Mark 5:18-20. (Answer this question even if you didn't make any changes in your paragraph boundaries.)

ANALYSIS 42:

1) Look for the places in your natural story where there are changes that show that there is a boundary—Look for changes in time, place, participants or “action” (change from setting information to events, events to quotation, etc.). If there is only one change, see if there is also a change in theme. You may want to write the new theme, or a few words that show the theme, in the Analysis column.

2) Write your observations in the Analysis column.

3) If there seem to be too many short paragraphs in your natural story, see if you can combine some of them with a theme that fits the paragraphs that you are putting together.

4) Draw a double line at each paragraph boundary and a dark line at each episode boundary in your natural story. (The beginning and end of the story are also episode boundaries.)

5) Draw a double line at each paragraph boundary and a dark line at each episode boundary in your chart that shows your translation of Mark 5:1-20.

ANALYSIS 43:

1) Look at the beginning of each sentence in your natural story to see which ones have no marker. If a sentence with no marker is at the beginning of a paragraph, write No marker

(underlined) in the type of Boundary Marker or Connector column. If a sentence with no marker is not at the beginning of a paragraph, write 'No marker' (not underlined) in the Type of Boundary Marker or Connector column.

2) If you are not sure whether a sentence has a marker or not, skip that sentence and go on to the next sentence.

ANALYSIS 44:

- 1) Look at the beginning of each sentence in your natural story for a connecting word or a time word.
- 2) If you find one at the beginning of a paragraph, write 'connecting word' (underlined) or 'time word' (underlined) in the Type of Boundary Marker or Connector column.
- 3) If you find one that is not at the beginning of a paragraph, write 'connecting word' (no underline) or 'time word' (no underline) in the Type of Boundary Marker or Connector column.

ANALYSIS 45:

- 1) Look at the beginning of each sentence in your natural story for a time marker or a location marker.

Look for tail-head connections at the end of each sentence along with the beginning of the next.

- 2) If you find any of these markers, write "Time marker" or "Location marker" or "Tail-head connection" in the Type of Boundary Marker or Connector column. If the time or location marker or the "head" of a tail-head connection is at the beginning of a paragraph, underline it.

ANALYSIS 46:

- 1) Look at the beginning of each sentence in your natural story for a marker that points back. Look for a burger structure at the beginning and end of each paragraph and the beginning and end of the story. Look for a summary statement at the end of each episode in your story.
- 2) If you find any of these markers, write 'Marker that points back' or 'Burger structure' or 'Summary statement' in the Type of Boundary Marker or Connector column. If the marker is at the beginning of a paragraph, underline it.
- 3) Look to see if you have shown in the Type of Boundary Marker or Connector column what kind of marker is used at the beginning of each sentence, including those with "No marker."

ANALYSIS 47:

- 1) Look for the types of boundary markers and connectors (no marker, connecting word, time word, time marker, location marker, tail-head connection, marker that points back, burger structure, or summary statement) in your chart of Mark 5:1-20. In the Type of Boundary Marker, Connector column, tell what kind of boundary marker or connector is used for each sentence. If the marker is at the beginning of a paragraph, underline it.
- 2) Make a table to compare the boundary markers in your natural story with the boundary markers in your translation of Mark 5:1-20. (Write sentence numbers in the table.) Write your observations and translation applications under the table.

Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers in a Natural Story and a Bible story

	<u>Story</u>	<u>Mark 5:1-20</u>
No marker		
Connecting word		
Time word		
Time marker		
Location marker		
Tail-head connection		

Marker that points back		
Burger structure		
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

- 3) If "And" is never used at the beginning of a sentence in your language, mention it in your Observations and Translation Applications. (You might need to look at several stories to see if "And" can be used at the beginning of a sentence.)
- 4) Make any changes that you need to make in Mark 5:1-20 to make the boundary marking sound more natural.
- 5) **WRITE-UP - Translation Application:** If you have made any changes in the boundary markers in your translation of Mark 5:1-20, tell what changes you have made and why.
- 6) Make a table to compare the connectors in your natural story with the connectors in your translation of Mark 5:1-20. Write your observations and translation applications under the table.

Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within Paragraphs in a Natural Story and a Bible story

	Story	"Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits" Mark 5:1-20
No Marker		
Connecting word		
Time word		
Time marker		
Tail-head connection		
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

- 6) If "And" is never used at the beginning of a sentence in your language, mention it in your Observations and Translation Applications. (You might need to look at several stories to see if "And" can be used at the beginning of a sentence.)
- 7) Make any changes that you need to make in Mark 5:1-20 to make the connectors at the beginning of sentences within a paragraph sound more natural.
- 7) **WRITE-UP - Translation Application:** If you have made any changes in the connectors in your translation of Mark 5:1-20, tell what changes you have made and why.

Report to the Class

Each team should give a report to the class tomorrow.

- 1) Tell the class what your story was about, or read the English BT of the story to the class.
- 2) Share some things you have learned, or been reminded of, about your language during the workshop. Tell how you will use what you have learned to make your translation sound natural.
- 3) These are the topics we have covered:
 - Communication Situation, Pattern of a Story

- Oral Style and Written Style
- Talking about the People in a Story
- Showing Respect
- Reporting Speech
- The Peak of a Story - Peak-marking and marking the Initial Event
- Theme
- Boundaries and Connectors

- 4) You can use the projector for your presentation or provide a handout, if you wish.
- 5) Each MTT on your team should share something.

If you would like feedback on your write-up, you can give the instructor your charted story and your write-up on a travel drive, or email them to me. I will look at them after the workshop.

APPENDIX D
ANALYSIS TABLES

Translator 1A

Table 1: Comparison of information in quote formulas

	<u>Natural story</u> “The day the soldiers caught Jah”	<u>Translated Bible story, Mark 5:1-20</u> “Demon-possessed Man”
<u>Number and types of quotations</u>	Direct quotes 3 Semi-direct quotes <u>Indirect quotes</u> TOTAL 3	Direct quotes 6 Semi-direct quotes <u>Indirect quotes</u> 1 TOTAL 7
<u>Quote Formulas</u>	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word 1 Speaker + <u>listener</u> + speech word 2	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word 2 Speaker + <u>listener</u> + speech word 5

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

1. The natural story has : 1 speaker + speech word
 2 Speaker + listener + speech word
 3 direct quotes
2. The bible story has: 2 speaker + speech word
 4 speaker + listener + speech word
 6 direct quotes
3. Quote formula comes before quote.

Table 2: Location of quotations

	<u>Natural Story</u> “The day the soldiers caught Jah”	<u>Mark 5:1-20</u> “Demon-possessed Man”
Setting 2ab	When Jah went to town	
Initial Event 3ab	Jah met the soldiers	7a Direct
Increasing Tension 4ab	Jah ran away from soldier	9ab Direct
Major Problems 5ab	6abc, 7abc, (8abc was not on 1A's table)	10a Indirect, 12a direct
Problems Solved 11abc		19bc direct
Closing		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: (The translator misunderstood the assignment initially, so his storyline was cluttered with information that was not quotations. The story only has quotations in the Major problems section which clearly contrasts with the Mark story.)

Table 3: Comparison of Peak-marking Features

Peak-marking in <u>Jah</u> Story	Peak-marking in Mark 5: 1-20,
Short sentences	
Direct quote	Direct quote
Repeated words	Repeated words
Tail-head	
Super words	
Vivid language	Vivid language
	Parallelism

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: Peak marking words in the natural story but not in the Bible story are: short sentences, tail-head, super words. These words would be found in other Bible stories.

Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers

	Story The day the soldiers caught Jah	Mark 5:1-20
No marker	8a, 11a = 2	1a, 6ab = 2
Connecting word		9a, 19a = 2
Time word		20a = 1
Time marker		18a = 1
Location marker		
Tail-head connection		
Marker that points back		17a = 1
Burger structure		
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: I observed that there is no marker in the natural, but Mark 5:1-20 there are 2 [no] markers, 2 connecting words, 1 time marker, 1 time word, and 1 marker that points back.

Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within Paragraphs¹

	<u>Jah</u> <u>Story</u>	"Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits" Mark 5:1-20
No Marker	8a, 11a = 2	
Connecting word		
Time word		
Time marker		
Tail-head connection		
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

Translator 1B

Table 1: Comparison of Information in Quote Formulas

	<u>Natural story</u> "The day the soldiers caught Jah"	<u>Translated Bible story, Mark 5:1-20</u> "Demon-possessed Man"
<u>Number and types of quotations</u>	Direct quotes 3 Semi-direct quotes <u>Indirect quotes</u> TOTAL 3	Direct quotes 6 Semi-direct quotes <u>Indirect quotes</u> 1 TOTAL 7
<u>Quote Formulas</u>	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word 1 Speaker + <i>listener</i> + speech word 2	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word 2 Speaker + <i>listener</i> + speech word 5

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: I observe that quote formulas come before the direct quote. In the natural story we have 3, speaker and speech word 1, speaker + listener + speech word 2. In the Bible story, direct quote 6, speaker plus speech word 2, speaker + listener + speech word 5.

¹ This table was not understood or not completed by 1A as the story has many markers. There is some confusion about which connectors to mark when it is not always clear when a conjunction should have started a sentence rather than come between them.

Table 2: Location of quotations

	Natural Story “Jah”	Mark 5:1-20 “Demon-possessed Man”
Setting 2ab	Jah went to look for food	
Initial Event 3ab	Jah met the soldiers	7a direct, 18a, 19a
Increasing Tension 4ab	When Jah ran away ²	9ab direct
Major Problems	5ab, 17ab, 18 ab direct	10a indirect & 12a
Problems Solved		19a [19bc] direct
Closing		

Table 3: Comparison of Peak-marking Features

Peak-marking in <u>Jah</u> Story	Peak-marking in Mark 5: 1-20,
Short sentence	
Direct quote	Direct quote
Repeated words	Repeated words
Tail-head	
Super word	
Vivid language	Vivid language
	Parallelism

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

What I observed is that there are some peak marking such as short sentence, tail-head and super words that are mentioned in the natural story and not in the Mark 5:1-20 text, But maybe they could be found in other Bible stories or text.

Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers

	Story The day the soldiers caught Jah	Mark 5:1-20
No marker	6ab, 8ab, 11a	1a, 6ab = 2
Connecting word		9a, 19a = 2
Time word		20a = 1
Time marker		18a = 1
Location marker		

² See note under Table 2 on page 292.

Tail-head connection		
Marker that points back		17a = 1
Burger structure		
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: What I observe is that the Bible story had many [more] markers than that of the natural story and marker of the Bible and that of the natural stories are at the beginning of paragraphs.

Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within Paragraphs

	<u>Jah Story</u>	“Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits” Mark 5:1-20
No Marker	3a, 7a,	24
Connecting word	5b, 9a	24
Time word	5a, 15a, 18a	2a, 4a, 18a
Time marker	2a, 6a, 15a	5a, 6a
Tail-head connection		17a
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: In my observation there are more markers in the Bible story that is in the paragraph than that of the natural story.

Translator 1C

Table 1: Comparison of Information in Quote Formulas

	<u>Natural story</u> “Complaint from the farm”	Translated Bible story, Mark 5:1-20 “Demon-possessed Man”
<u>Number and types of quotations</u>	Direct quotes 7 Semi-direct quotes Indirect quotes 2 embedded TOTAL 9	Direct quotes 6 Semi-direct quotes Indirect quotes 1 TOTAL 7
<u>Quote Formulas</u>	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word 4 Speaker + <u>listener</u> + speech word 5	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word 2 Speaker + <u>listener</u> + speech word 6

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

1. When someone answers a question, we only see the speech word “waar” and no other one.
2. The quotation formula is always before the quote.

Table 2: Location of quotations

	Natural Story “Complaint from the farm”	Mark 5:1-20 “ <u>Demon-possessed Man</u> ”
Setting	Direct	Direct
Initial Event		Direct
Increasing Tension	Direct	Direct - 2
Major Problems	Direct	Direct – 2 Indirect – 1
Problems Solved	Direct	Direct
Closing	Direct ³	

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS: Only initial event is without a direct quote, but it could be found in other stories.

Table 3: Comparison of Peak-marking Features

Peak-marking in <u>Complaint Story</u>	Peak-marking in <u>Mark 5: 1-20</u>
Direct quote	Direct
Vivid language	Vivid langauge
Figure of speech	
Repeated word	Repeated word
Question and answer	Long sentence
parallelism	

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

There are figures of speech, parallelism, and question and complete answer in the natural story but not in this part of the (Bible) story, but can be found in other stories.

Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers

	Story Complaint from the farm	Mark 5:1-20
No marker		
Connecting word		
Time word		
Time marker		
Location marker		

³ There is no quote at the closing in 1C’s text chart.

Tail-head connection		
Marker that points back		
Burger structure		
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

1. There are less “no marker” in the natural story than the Bible story.
2. There are also less connecting words from the natural story than the Bible story.
3. The natural story does not have any of the rest of the markers on the chart.

Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within Paragraphs

	<u>Complaint Story</u>	<u>“Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits”</u> <u>Mark 5:1-20</u>
No Marker	5	24 ⁴
Connecting word	5b, 9b = 2 (mid sentence)	24
Time word	5a, 15a, 17a = 3	2a, 4a = 2
Time marker	2ab, 6a, 15a = 3	5a, 6b = 2
Tail-head connection		
Ending boundary – Summary statement		

Translator 2A

Table 1: Comparison of Information in Quote Formulas

	<u>Natural story</u> “Bush confusion”	<u>Translated Bible story, Mark 5:1-20</u> “Demon-possessed Man”
<u>Number and types of quotations</u>	Direct quotes Semi-direct quotes Indirect quotes 1 TOTAL 1	Direct quotes 5 Semi-direct quotes 1 Indirect quotes 1 TOTAL 7
<u>Quote Formulas</u>	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word 1 Speaker + <i>listener</i> + speech word	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word 1 Speaker + <i>listener</i> + speech word 6

⁴ The assignment was misunderstood and all conjunctions even mid-sentence were counted.

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

My observation is that both stories have quote formulas, direct and indirect quotes. There was no listener in some areas. In the natural story, not many quotes were found.

Table 2: Location of quotations

	Natural Story " " "	Mark 5:1-20 <u>"Demon-possessed Man"</u>
Setting		Direct
Initial Event		Direct
Increasing Tension		Semi-direct, direct
Major Problems		Direct, indirect
Problems Solved	Indirect quote	Direct
Closing		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

- I observe that more quotations are found in the Mark 5:1-20 story than in the natural story. The quotations in the Mark story are all important.
- The quotation in the natural story is found in the problems solved area and the ones in the Mark story are found in the setting, initial event, increasing tension, major problems and problems solved pattern.
- No. The quotation in the natural story is different from that in the Mark story which is found in the problem solved pattern.

Table 3: Comparison of Peak-marking Features

Peak-marking in <u>Bush confusion</u> Story	Peak-marking in Mark 5: 1-20,
Contrast	
Parallelism	Parallelism
Repeated action	
Vivid language	Vivid language
Indirect quote	Indirect quote
	X structure
	Semi-direct, direct quote
	Long-short
Burger structure	
More connectors	
Super words	
Longer sentences	
Short sentences	

Table 4: Comparison of Boundary Markers

	Story: Bush confusion	Mark 5:1-20
No marker	3a, 5a, 20a = 3	1a, 6ab, 9a, 9cd, 11a, 14a = 6
Connecting word	1	19a, 20ab = 2
Time word		
Time marker	14a, 18a, 19a, 21a = 4	18ab =
Location marker		
Tail-head connection		
Marker that points back		(20ab should be here)
Burger structure	4 = 1	
Ending boundary – Summary statement	21ab = 1	

Table 5: Comparison of Connectors within Paragraphs

	Bush Confusion Story	"Jesus Heals a Man with Evil Spirits" Mark 5:1-20
No Marker	4, 7a, 8a, 9a, 10a, 11a, 12a, 13a, 17a, 20b = 10	2a, 3a, 3b, 2d, 4fg, 5a, 5bc, 6cde, 7ab, 8a, 10a, 12ab, 13g, 13hi, 14ef, 15c, 15de, 16a = 20 ⁵ (should be included: 2c, 4c)
Connecting word	15 = 1	4a, 4b, 4de, 8b, 10b, 13de, 14cd, 15ab, 17ab, 19bc, 20gh = 11
Time word		
Time marker	6ab = 1	2ab, 13ab, 15fg = 3
Tail-head connection		(13ab, 15fg, 17ab should be here)
Ending boundary – Summary statement		20gh = 1

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

⁵ Only sentence initial connectors were to be listed, but 2a, 8b, 10b are mid-sentence thus skewing the results. I have bolded those that are true sentence initial connectors. The count is off because some were crossed out.

Translator 2B

Table 1: Comparison of Information in Quote Formulas

	<u>Natural story</u> “Collateral”	<u>Translated Bible story, Mark 5:1-20</u> “Demon-possessed Man”
<u>Number and types of quotations</u>	Direct quotes Semi-direct quotes <u>Indirect quotes</u> TOTAL	Direct quotes 5 Semi-direct quotes 1 <u>Indirect quotes</u> 1 TOTAL 7
<u>Quote Formulas</u>	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word Speaker + <u>listener</u> + speech word	No quote formula Speaker only, no speech word Speaker + speech word Speaker + <u>listener</u> + speech word

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

There are no quotations in my natural story because I wrote only what happened in the story without quoting the characters/the participants.

Table 2: Location of quotations⁶

	<u>Natural Story</u> “ ”	<u>Mark 5:1-20</u> “Demon-possessed Man”
Setting		
Initial Event	Direct	Direct
Increasing Tension		Direct
Major Problems	Direct	
Problems Solved	indirect	
Closing		

OBSERVATIONS AND TRANSLATION APPLICATIONS:

In my observation, quotes were left out places where they were not supposed to be omitted, and their omission didn't give the clearer meaning of why certain statements were made/how.

⁶ This translator had only summarized the story so his charts do not reflect accurately what occurred. He realized this and tried to put things in from memory. He also left the workshop early due to illness, so only Table 1 and 2 were completed.

APPENDIX E

FINAL ASSIGNMENT

Workshop 2017 final assignment

Directions: Revise each of the 4 Mark passages in your special Paratext 7 project.

The four passages are: Mark 4:35-41, Mark 5: 1-20, Mark 10:13-16 and Mark 12:1-12

Make the revisions right in the text.

For each revision **insert a note** explaining why you did it. Select the text you changed and go to Insert, then click on Note. Explain why you changed the text. For example, maybe you added vivid language, so you say you made the language more vivid and give me the back translation. Assign the note to Becky Grossmann and click OK.

Do NOT make a change just to make a change. Make the change if you think it might be a good change for your translation. If you see something you did just like your natural stories and you want to point it out to me, that is ok.

When you are done going through all the passages, do a **send and receive**. Then send me an email to tell me you are done. My email address is becky.grossmann@lbt.org . You can also tell Tamba to send me an email. When I have seen the work, then you will receive something for doing the work.

It would be very good, if you do this soon while it is all fresh in your minds. Then you will remember it better and start applying your new knowledge to your regular translation projects. If possible, try to finish this up by **September 15 or even earlier**.

Here are some of the topics for you to consider in each passage. There may be others as well. You might find things in some of the texts but not all but you should look for them. Revise your texts if you see they do not match your natural story and you think that the translation will be better. These are listed here to assist your thinking and searching. You do not have to write out answers here. Just change your text and include your explanation in the notes you insert.

1. Participant reference: How did you distinguish major participants from secondary or minor participants? Does this match what was in your natural text?

How are they introduced and how do you keep track of them?

Look for places you have used too many names or too many pronouns or too few names and pronouns.

Do you need to name the listener in a quote formula? Does this change in peak and how?

2. Respect: Do your participants show respect in a natural way in your translated texts?

3. Repetition: Review all the types of repetition. Do you have the right amount in your translated texts?

Do you need to have some tail-head or head-head constructions anywhere?

4. Do you see any places that a figure of speech would make your translation sound more natural even if the source text does not have one?

5. Peak: Look for peak marking features you had in your natural stories. Do you need to revise the peak in your Bible stories to include these features? Things like direct quotes, vivid language, repetition of any kind, super words, etc.

6. Quotations: Look for your direct, indirect, and semi-direct quotations. Are they in the appropriate place in your translated text?

Do you need to have more direct quotes especially at peak?

Do you always need to include the listener in the quote formula?

Do you have the correct quote formula each time?

7. Theme: In Mark 10:15 did you use the right expression at the beginning of the verse to get people's attention, so that they will notice the theme of this story? Are there other places you need to make the theme clearer?

Look at your section head for each story. Does each section head tell enough about the theme (the main message) of the story to help people to understand the story?

8. Connectors and Boundary markers:

Can you use "And" at the beginning of a sentence in your language?

Do you sometimes need to use a word that means "And" or "Then" to keep Bible stories moving forward in your translation?

Look at the connector at the beginning of each sentence in each of your Bible stories. (Some sentences may not have a connector.) Do you need to make any changes in the connectors at the beginning of sentences?

9. Look for any other place where your text follows the English source text too closely and revise them to be more natural. Perhaps there is a good place to use an ideophone if it does not distract from the focus of the text.

APPENDIX F
SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATIONS
AND SUMMARY STATEMENTS

Week 1 July 2017 Workshop Summary

TOPICS DISCUSSED: Communication situation, Pattern of a story, Oral and Written Style, Talking about the People in a Story, Showing Respect, Peak-marking, Reporting Speech.

Please answer the following questions carefully and thoroughly. You may write more on the back or on an attached sheet if necessary.

- 1. What new things did you learn about your language that you didn't know before or that were made clearer to you? Be specific. (For example, I learned that the listener is not always mentioned in the quote formula in my language.)**

Most just listed off topics. Several participants mention the Communication situation and its components. Another participant defined the various levels of participants in a story and another went on to describe how they can be introduced.

One participant learned that the age of a story teller might determine the vocabulary, that direct quotations can be used in an important part of the story, and repetition may give attention or emphasis to something in the story. This participant also learned how to determine the main character and to recognize tail-head types of connectors.

Another now recognizes the word order of his language and the pattern of a story.

- 2. How will this help you as you translate? Be specific. (For example, I learned that I don't always have to put the listener in my quote formula. I will not always have to make it explicit even though my source text might make it explicit.)**

One participant knows how to recognize quote formulas and the different types of quotations but did not indicate how these will be used. Another indicated paying more attention to the different types of quotations.

Another participant indicated intentions to use the various types of connectors and to understand who the main character is.

One participant will be sure to use forms of respect where needed.

Another participant indicated he will more readily know who and what is in focus in the story with the assumption he will put these in focus in his translation.

Several are more aware of the need to balance oral and written style and be mindful of making the text easy to read and understand and to be sensitive to the fact that many people will be listening rather than reading.

3. What other things did you learn this week that will help you as you translate? Be very specific.

Much here repeated what was answered in question 1 and 2, listing the topics that we talked about and having an awareness of them.

4. What changes did you or could you make to any of your Mark texts? Name the passage reference and show what changes you think should be made or maybe could be made.

One translator recognized a very long sentence that needed to be divided, added several connectors where one was to call attention to an important part, and he reworded an awkward sentence.

Several corrected vocabulary that was wrong.

Participant Evaluation – Narrative Discourse Workshop (Liberia)

24 July-4 August, 2017

1) What things that we discussed helped you? How can you use what you learned in your translation project?

Several participants thought all topics were useful and expressed desire to use them in their translation work.

Other participants appreciated learning about a story pattern and the boundary markers and will try to apply such features to translation.

Several participants mentioned the importance of recognizing oral and written style as well as using features that show respect.

2) What was the hardest thing to learn?

Peaking marking, understanding markers, and actually applying knowledge to the translations were mentioned as the hardest things to learn.

3) How can this workshop be improved?

- By studying more material
- More time to demonstrate on each topic after presentation so we can learn from each other.
- Have us practice teaching in class to demonstrate the lesson we have learned.
- Find a closer lodging location as transportation was a problem

4) Do you want to say anything about the place where the workshop was held, the meals, or the schedule?

Most participants liked the venue and the food. One thought there was too much pepper in the food.

TOPICS DISCUSSED: Communication situation, Pattern of a story, Oral and Written Style, Talking about the People in a Story, Showing Respect, Peak-marking, Reporting Speech, Theme, Boundaries and Connectors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, A. K. M., Stephen E. Fowl, Kevin J. Vanhoozer, and Francis Watson. *Reading Scripture with the Church: Toward a Hermeneutic for Theological Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Adam, A. K. M. "Poaching on Zion: Biblical Theology as Signifying Practice." In *Reading Scripture with the Church: Toward a Hermeneutic for Theological Interpretation*, by eds. A. K. M. Adam, Stephen E. Fowl, Kevin J. Vanhoozer, & Francis Watson, 17-34. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Alexander, Desmond T., and Brian S. Rosner. *New Dictionary of the Bible Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. London and New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Barnwell, Katharine. *Bible Translation: An Introductory Course in Translation Principles*. Dallas: SIL International, 2002.
- Bartholomew, Craig G., and David J. H. Beldman, eds. *Hearing the Old Testament: Listening for God's Address*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2012.
- Bartsch, Carla K. "Life-transforming Translations: How can we Teach Translators with Limited Education to Produce Natural-sounding Translations of the Scriptures?" *Bible Translation 2015 Conference DVD: Bible Translation and Transformation*. Dallas: Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics, 2015.
- . "Narrative Discourse Workshop." *Unpub MS*. July 24, 2017.
- . "Oral Style, Written Style, and Bible Translation." *Notes on Translation*, 1997: 41-48.
- Beldman, David J. H. "Literary Approaches and Old Testament Interpretation." In *Hearing the Old Testament: Listening for God's Address*, by eds. Craig G. Bartholomew, & David J. H. Beldman, 67-95. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2012.
- Bevans, Stephen B. *Models of Contextual Theology*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2002.
- Bird, Michael F. *Evangelical Theology: A Biblical and Systematic Introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2013.
- Blackburn, Perry L. "Contextual adjustment as a tool for teaching naturalness in translation." *JOTT*, 2003: 56-66.

- Boda, Mark J. "Biblical Theology and Old Testament Interpretation." In *Hearing the Old Testament: Listening for God's Address*, by eds. Craig G. Bartholomew, & David J. H. Beldman, 122-153. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2012.
- Cahill, Michael, and Keith Benn. "Overliteralness and Mother-Tongue Translators." *Journal of Translation*, 2011: 49-61.
- Carson, Donald A. "The Limits of Dynamic Equivalence in Bible Translation." *Evangelical Review of Theology* 9, 1985: 200-213.
- Culy, Martin M. "The Top-Down Approach to Translation." *Notes on Translation*, 1993: 28-51.
- de Vries, Lourens. "The notion of genre and the nature of Bible translations." *Notes on Translation --Summer Institute of Linguistics* 13, 1999: 26-42.
- Dooley, Robert A. "Relevance Theory and Discourse Analysis:Complementary Approaches for Translator Training." *GIALens*, 2008 (3): 1-11.
- Galvao, Gabriella C.T. "Linguistic Interference in Translated Academic Texts." Växjö University, May 27, 2009.
- Giles, Glinda. "Duna is not Greek, but how far can one go?" *The Bible Translator-Practical Papers*, October 1972: 406-412.
- Grimes, Joseph. "Measuring 'Naturalness' in a Translation." *The Bible Translator* 14 no. 2, 1963: 49-62.
- Grossmann, Becky, and Samuel Cooper. *Dan Sociolinguistic Survey July 12-19, 2012*. Unpublished Manuscript, 2012.
- Gunton, Colin E. *A Brief Theology of Revelation: The 1993 Warfield Lectures*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995.
- Halme-Berneking, Riikka. "Helping Bible Translators Recognize Linguistic Interference between Angolan Bantu Languages and Portuguese." *The Bible Translator-Practical Papers* 65, no 3, 2014: 353-368. Accessed June 21, 2017, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2051677014553550>.
- Hatim, Basil, and Ian Mason. *Discourse and the Translator*. New York: Longman, 1990.
- . *The Translator as Communicator*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Havlásková, Zuzana. "Interference in Students' Translations." *Master's Diploma Thesis*. Masaryk University Department of English and American Studies, 2010.

Hill, Harriet, Ernst-August Gutt, Margaret Hill, Christoph Unger, and Rick Floyd. *Bible Translation Basics: Communicating Scripture in a Relevant Way*. Dallas: SIL International, 2011.

Hodgson, Robert. "Introduction." In *From One Medium to Another: Basic Issues for Communicating the Scriptures in New Media*, by eds. Robert Hodgson, & S.J., Paul A. Soukup, 3-19. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1997.

Jensen, Peter. *The Revelation of God: Contours of Christian Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002.

Kraft, Charles H. "Christianity in Culture: A Study in Dynamic Biblical Theologizing in Cross-Cultural Perspective (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1979)." In *Models of Contextual Theology*, by Stephen B. Bevans, 295-296. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2008.

Levering, Matthew. *Engaging the Doctrine of Revelation: The Mediation of the Gospel through Church and Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. "Checking Translations for Discourse Features." *Journal of Translation*, 2006: 23-29.

—. "Introduction to 'Discourse for Translation' Files: Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis." *Stephen H. Levinsohn*. 2015. <http://www-01.sil.org/~levinsohns/narr.pdf> (accessed August 15, 2016).

Loewen, Jacob A. "Training Translators to Write in Their Own Language." *The Bible Translator* 30 no.2, 1979: 224-230.

Luther's Small Catechism with Explanation. St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 1986.

Nicolle, Steve. "Narrative Discourse Analysis and Bible Translation: Training Materials Based on Acts 16:16-40." *SIL Publications*. 2017. <https://www.sil.org/resources/publications/entry/69386> (accessed June 22, 2017).

Noss, Philip A, ed. *A History of Bible Translation*. Rome: Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 2007.

Provan, Iain. "Hearing the Historical Books." In *Hearing the Old Testament: Listening for God's Address*, by eds. Craig G. Bartholomew, & David J. H. Beldman, 254-276. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2012.

Robinson, Douglas. *Becoming a Translator*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

Robinson, Dow F. "Native Texts and Frequency Counts as Aids to the Translator." *The Bible Translator* 14 no. 2, 1963 : 63-71.

Schultz, Richard. "Hearing the Major Prophets." In *Hearing the Old Testament: Listening for God's Address*, by eds. Craig G. Bartholomew, & David J. H. Beldman, 332-355. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2012.

Smith, Joan. ""A search for naturalness in translated material." *SIL Mexico Workpapers* 9, 1987: 101-106.

Stine, Phil C. "Translators and Texts." *The Bible Translator* 29 no. 3, 1979: 301-306.

Vanhoozer, Kevin J. "Imprisoned or Free?: Text, Status, and Theological Interpretation in the Master/Slave Discourse of Philemon." In *Reading Scripture with the Church: Toward a Hermeneutic for Theological Interpretation*, by eds. A. K. M. Adam, Stephen E. Fowl, Kevin J. Vanhoozer, & Francis Watson, 51-93. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006.

Vaz, Christopher Augustin. *Functional Equivalent Translation of New Testament Hortatory Discourse into Hilmaia*. Ph.D. diss, Fuller Theological Seminary School of Intercultural studies, 2011.

Waltke, Bruce K. "Textual Criticism of the Old Testament and Its Relation to Exegesis and Theology." In *A Guide to Old Testament Theology and Exegesis: The Introductory Articles from the New International Dictionary of the Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, by ed. Willem A. VanGemeren, 48-64. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999.

Walton, John H. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006.

Watters, James K. "Contrastive Discourse Pragmatics and Translation with Implications for Training." *The Bible Translator*, January 2000: 124-134.

Wendland, Ernst R. *Contextual Frames of Reference in Translation: A Coursebook for Bible Translators and Teachers*. Manchester, U.K.: St. Jerome, 2008.

- . "On the Relevance of 'Relevance Theory' for Bible Translation." *The Bible Translator* 47, no. 1, January 1996: 126-137.
- . "Receptor Language Style and Bible Translation. II: The Problem of Control in Restructuring." *The Bible Translator* 32 no. 3, 1981: 319-328.
- . "Receptor Language Style and Bible Translation. III: Training Translators about Style." *The Bible Translator* 33 no. 1, 1982: 115-127.
- . "Receptor Language Style and Bible Translation: A Search for "Language Which Grabs the Heart'." *The Bible Translator* 32 no. 1, 1981: 107-124.

- . "Translating the Literature of Scripture: A Literary -Rhetorical Approach to Bible Translation, (Dallas: SIL International, 2004)." In *A History of Bible Translation*, by Philip A. Noss, 15. Rome: Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 2007.
- . "Translator Training in Africa: Is There a Better Way of Teaching and Learning?" *The Bible Translator Practical Papers*, April 2006: 58-64.
- . "What's the Difference? Similarity (and Dissimilarity) from a Cross-Cultural Perspective: Some Reflections upon the Notion of 'Acceptability' in Bible Translation." In *Similarity and Difference in Translation: Proceedings of the International Conference on Similarity and Translation : Bible House, New York City, May 31-June 1, 2001*, Vol. 1, by ed. Stefano Arduini, 329-358. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2007.

VITA

Name: Rebecca Suzanne Grossmann (née Tegtmeier)

Date and Place of Birth: October 25, 1963, Minot, ND, USA

Education:

B.A. (Bible Translation Studies), Concordia University, St. Paul, MN

M.A. (Linguistics), University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, TX

D.Min. (Bible Translation), Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary,
South Hamilton, MA

Period of Studies: May 2016-May 2019

Expected Graduation: May 2019